DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 744 CE 043 594

AUTHOR Dunwoody-Miller, Vera; Gutek, Barbara A.
TITLE Sexual Harassment in the State Workforce. Results of a Survey. S.H.E. Project Report.
INSTITUTION California State Employees' Association, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 141p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Compliance (Legal); Employed Women; *Employee Attitudes; Employer Attitudes; *Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Practices; Employment Problems; *Government Employees; Government Role; *Sexual Harassment; *State Government; State Legislation
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

State workers in California were surveyed to determine if they had been sexually harassed on the job, and what they knew about procedures and laws for dealing with such harassment. Responses were received from 1,151 professional and administrative employees representing a sexual and ethnic distribution similar to the total civil service work force in the state. The survey found that most workers agree with the current legal definition of sexual harassment, although more women than men are likely to label any sexual incident at work as sexual harassment. The study also found that more people experience "less severe" harassment (such as sexual comments) than "more severe" harassment (such as sexual assault). About 19 percent of the workers said they had been sexually harassed as state civil service employees; about 89 percent of these employees were women. Only about half of the workers surveyed were aware of a sexual harassment policy and only half knew that their department had a discrimination complaint process. Although most workers believed that their departments would care about them and enforce policies if they were harassed at work and filed a complaint, they thought the process would not be very swift and were not completely sure that they would not suffer retaliation. The study concluded that the majority of state employees had not been harassed and had a very positive attitude toward their employer; those workers who were harassed, however, tended to be left without adequate information and support. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

S. H. E. Project Report

Sexual Harassment in the State Workforce: Results of a Survey

Vera Dunwoody-Miller

Barbara A. Gutek

Claremont Graduate School

March, 1985

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report wish to thank the California State Employees Association and the California Commission on The Status of Women for their support of this important project. We would also especially like to thank Dr. Mary T. Lebrato for her expertise, her support throughout this project and, most importantly, for her dedication to the elimination of sexual harassment in the workplace.

Table of Contents

SECTION		PAGE
I.	Overview	
	A. Executive Summary	7
	B. Section for Managers	12
	C. Background / Summary of Previous Major Research	18
II.	Methodology	
	A. Subjects	24
	B. Questionnaire	25
	C. Procedure	26
III.	Demographic Characteristics of All Respondents	
	A. Personal Characteristics	29
	Gender	
	Ethnicity	
	Age	
	Marital Status	
	Educational Level	
	B. Occupational Characteristics	32
	Occupation	
	Length of Employment at Current Job	
	Current Work Schedule	

County of Current Job

Length of Employment in This Type of Work

Length of All Employment with the State of California

Salary Level

IV. Definitions of Sexual Harassment 38

A. Opinion of EEOC Definition of Sexual Harassment 39

B. Incidents that Constitute Sexual Harassment 39

V. The Workplace 42

A. Sexual Harassment: How Much of a Problem Is It? 43

B. Departmental Policies Regarding Sexual Harassment 43

C. Departmental Complaint Processes Regarding Sexual Harassment 48

D. Possible Actions Available Within Departments For Employees Who Have Been Sexually Harassed and Perceived Effectiveness of the Actions 53

E. Employees' Projected Actions Concerning 54

Sexual Harassment

VI. Frequency and Types of Sexual Interactions in the Workplace 57

A. Personal Experiences of Respondents 58

B. Experiences of Others Known to Respondents 59

VII. Demographic Characteristics of Sexually Harassed Respondents 61

A. Personal Characteristics 61

Gender

Ethnicity

Age

Marital Status

Educational Level

B. Occupational Characteristics 64

Occupation

Length of Employment at Current Job

Salary Level

Length of All Employment for State of California

VIII. Classification of Sexual Harassment Experience and Actions Taken by Victims 67

A. Classification 68

B. Actions Taken and Outcome of Action 68

C. Reasons for Actions/Response of Department to Actions 69

D. Knowledge of Complaint Process 71

IX. Consequences of Sexual Harassment 73

A. Consequences Suffered by Victims Known to Respondent 74

B. Consequences Reported by Sexual Harassment Victims 75

X. Constraints of the Survey 77

XI. Bibliographic Resources 79

I. OVERVIEW

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During 1983-84, the S.H.E. (Sexual Harassment in Employment) Project of the California Commission on the Status of Women was organized under the direction of Mary T. Lebrato to obtain and disseminate information about sexual harassment in the workplace. As part of this large project Claremont Graduate School, with the support, help and sponsorship of the S.H.E. Project and the California State Employees Association, conducted a large survey of a sample of California civil service workers using mail questionnaires.

The research was conducted to achieve the following goals:

1) Assess employees' evaluation of the current legal definition of sexual harassment.

2) Understand the extent and consequences of sexual harassment among state employees.

3) Assess employees' knowledge of policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment.

4) Assess employees' opinions concerning the effectiveness of these policies and procedures.

5) Examine the experiences of victims of harassment, especially their departments' responses.

The results of this survey should currently be of particular importance to employers due to Senate Bill 2012 which is effective as of January 1, 1985. This new bill makes it an unlawful employment practice to fail to take reasonable steps to prevent sexual harassment.

The results reported herein were based on responses from 1,151 surveys distributed to CSEA Unit 1 employees. Unit 1, the largest CSEA bargaining unit, represents professional and administrative staff. This unit was chosen because the distribution of men and women and ethnicity is similar to the total civil service workforce in California. The following findings are relevant to the goals of this project.

Regarding assessment of the current legal definition of sexual harassment, most workers agree with the legal definition. However, women are more likely than men to label any sexual incident at work as sexual harassment.

Regarding the extent and consequences of sexual harassment at work, worker's own experiences were similar to experiences reported by workers in other surveys. More people experience "less severe" harassment (such as sexual comments) than "more severe" harassment (such as sexual assault). Across all experiences, women were much more frequent victims than men, another finding that is consistent with previous research. About 19% of the workers said they have been sexually harassed as a state civil service employee. About 89% of the harassed

employees were women.

Regarding knowledge of policies and procedures, only about half of the workers surveyed (54%) were aware of a sexual harassment policy and only half (52%) knew that their department had a discrimination complaint process. Less than half of the respondents knew that their department had a counselor for such complaints. Finally, the majority of respondents (56%) said that, as far as they knew, their department had not held any seminars or training concerning sexual harassment.

Regarding the effectiveness of policies and procedures, most workers indicated that their departments would care about them and enforce policies if they were harassed at work and filed a complaint. They also indicated, however, that the process would not be very swift and they were not completely sure that they would not suffer retaliation. Only 15% indicated that they thought retaliation was very unlikely.

Regarding the actual experiences of victims, very few victims file complaints and very few receive support from the state. Those who eventually do file a complaint have already tried a number of other strategies on their own. Most victims try to ignore the harassment (a relatively unsuccessful strategy) or tell the person to stop (a somewhat more successful strategy). When asked why they did not file a complaint, half said it would make their job situation unpleasant and 43% said they thought nothing would be done about it. In fact, of those

who did file a complaint, 38% said that the management in their department "did nothing" and only 5% said corrective action was taken. Victims of harassment reported a variety of consequences, notably that it affects their ability to do their work and work with the harasser.

In sum, the majority of state employees have not been harassed and the majority have very positive attitudes toward their employer. Those workers who are harassed, however, tend to be left to their own devices. They are not adequately informed and they do not receive the support that workers in general expect to receive.

Based on these findings, we can conclude that:

1) Employees do not receive enough information or training to understand policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment.

2) The organization does not presently provide adequate support to victims of sexual harassment. When the organization does respond, it tends to be slow and does not provide adequate protection to the victims.

3) Based on employees' responses, it appears that many departments are not fully in compliance with SB 2012.

It should be noted that the executive summary only includes very general highlights of the survey results. The reader is encouraged to read the specific results sections to fully appreciate the intricacies of this research report.

B. SECTION FOR MANAGERS: KEY FINDINGS

Awareness. In general, workers are aware of sexual harassment. They have heard the term and they have, in general, a fairly clear understanding of the term. Most agree with the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) definition of sexual harassment. Men, however, seem less sure than women whether or not an incident is sexual harassment and whether they agree or not with the EEOC definition.

While workers who answered the survey know about sexual harassment, they know less about the policies and procedures that are available to state employees; most did not know that a counselor was (or was supposed to be) available to employees who have a complaint. Very few employees said they have been to a training session or viewed a film on sexual harassment.

Among the employees who knew of the policies and procedures, they rated their overall effectiveness as only "somewhat effective". If employees are to do their part in eliminating sexual harassment by filing complaints and requesting investigations, they need information about the official policy and the appropriate procedures for action.

Incidence of Harassment and Sexual Interactions. Although it is not possible to make direct comparisons with other organizations, based on our knowledge of other studies, it appears the amount of sexual harassment reported in this survey is comparable to that reported in other organizations. It also

appears that the amount of sexual harassment reported in public sector employment is comparable to that in private sector employment. About 19% of the total sample reported that they had been sexually harassed while employed in the state civil service. About 89% of the victims of sexual harassment were women. Thus, these findings, like most other research on the topic, shows that women are much more likely than men to be victims of sexual harassment. The findings also suggest that minority women may be slightly more likely to be harassed than majority women.

While women are more often the victims of harassment, men are more often the harassers. Even among the male victims, men are frequently the harassers. In this survey half of the men who said they were harassed volunteered that the harasser was a man.

Sexuality is much more common at work than sexual harassment. While most respondents did not report personal experiences of sexual harassment, many reported sexual interactions at work. For example, the majority of both sexes said they have been recipients of sexual comments meant to be complimentary. Over 40% of both sexes said they have been the target of sexual jokes. Whether sexuality in the form of jokes and comments leads to more serious forms of sexual harassment is not clear from this study, but other research suggests that an emphasis on sexuality in the work environment facilitates sexual harassment.

The Role of Management. Ninety-eight percent of the workers responding to this survey indicated that management could take some action to reduce the amount of sexual harassment at work (only 2% stated that there "was little" management could do). Respondents indicated that the most effective action on the part of management is to conduct swift and thorough investigations of complaints of sexual harassment. By de-sexualizing the workplace, publicizing policies and procedures and carrying them out, and serving as a role model, management can do a great deal to eliminate sexual harassment at work.

What Workers Say They Will Do Versus What They Do. When workers are asked what they would do if they were harassed, they say they would take direct action suuch as "tell the person to stop" or "document the complaint/incident". However, what victims actually do is less direct. They tend to try to avoid the person or ignore the behavior first. Both of these strategies, incidentally, are not effective in stopping the harassment.

One reason for the difference between what people say they will do and what they do concerns organizational realities that people ignore in hypothetical situations. For example, if the harasser is a supervisor or even a superior but not a direct supervisor, it is awkward, to say the least, to confront the person directly. People are concerned about retaliation, about being labeled a troublemaker, about creating an unpleasant

situation at work, and about having their complaint ignored.

Organizational Support. Despite the fact that workers generally feel that they have the support of their department, they are concerned about making a formal complaint about harassment either to that department or outside it. Very few victims of harassment make formal complaints in any form. The people who have made complaints are even more pessimistic than others about receiving support from the department. Only 5% of the people who complained said that some corrective action was taken in their favor.

In addition, people do not begin by making a formal complaint. They usually try to handle the situation themselves by first ignoring the behavior or directly confronting the haraser. It is when these steps fail to stop the harassment that they consider further measures such as making a complaint to a supervisor, seeking counseling or therapy to help cope with the situation, or filing a grievance.

These findings strongly suggest that providing support for victims when the harassment is first discovered and swiftly and thoroughly investigating the case is likely to keep the problem from escalating into a costly and emotionally exhaustive court case.

Consequences of Harassment. Victims of harassment report a variety of negative consequences. Not surprisingly, they have difficulty working with the harasser and may have difficulty carrying out their jobs in general. Some of them seek therapy to help them cope with the harassment. Another common response is to request a job transfer, a move that can interrupt the victim's career progress and deprive the department of a good employee.

Recommendations for Change

The survey results lead to some fairly straight forward recommendations.

--First, work to disseminate information concerning sexual harassment policies and procedures. People do not know about them.

--Second, work to build confidence in workers that their complaints will be heard, that they will not be labeled troublemakers, and that they will not suffer retaliation for bringing up a legitimate complaint.

--Third, take complaints seriously. Respect the rights of the person making the complaint. Investigate the problem immediately and handle the problem "in house". Do not let the process escalate.

Departments in which complaints about sexual harassment are taken seriously and handled appropriately will not need to worry about developing confidence in their employees.

This survey shows that state workers already have very positive attitudes toward their employer. Most workers think that their employer will support them if they have a complaint about sexual harassment. However, a majority of the people who have been harassed have not had favorable experiences thus far. Following the three recommendations listed above should remedy the situation. Managers are also encouraged to fully explore specific results sections in this report in order to more effectively work toward the prevention and elimination of sexual harassment in the workplace.

C. BACKGROUND / SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

There were several goals for this study undertaken by the Sexual Harassment in Employment Project of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Claremont Graduate School and the California State Employees Association. One of the major goals was to understand the extent of sexual harassment at work among state employees' and possible consequences resulting from sexual harassment. We were also concerned with state employees' knowledge of policies and procedures currently available for dealing with sexual harassment. We wanted to learn employees' views of the relative merits of these policies and complaint procedures as means of dealing with the problem and the kinds of changes recommended by the employees. In order to learn this information, we sent questionaires to a large, relevant sample of California state employees (Unit 1).

The topic of sexual harassment has only recently become a matter of social and empirical interest but for the victims of sexual harassment it is a very old problem. Sexual harassment was a problem faced by paid women workers in the United States in colonial days. There are several instances of reports made by women workers protesting violence by male employers some as early as 1734 (Bularik, 1978).

Sexual harassment was not actually recognized as a social issue until the mid-1970's. It was at this time that several women's magazines such as REDBOOK and MS. ran articles and essays concerning sexual harassment in the workplace. With reported rates of sexual harassment as high as 88% (REDBOOK, 1976) it was all too clear that the notion of sexual harassment had become a part of many workers' vocabulary and their lives. (Schneider, 1982).

The first large scale, systematic analysis of sexual harassment as a social problem was Farley's (1978) book, SEXUAL SHAKEDOWN: THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WOMEN ON THE JOB. In her book, Farley defined the concept of sexual harssment and gave numerous examples of harassment of women in a variety of jobs and life situations.

Farley's book was followed closely by attorney Catharine MacKinnon's (1979) book, SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WORKING WOMEN. MacKinnon was not only interested in publicizing the existence of sexual harssment but also in providing a basis for legal action to combat sexual harassment. It was at this time that the concept of sexual harassment was linked to the concept of sexual discrimination. In a strong and convincing argument, MacKinnon contended that sexual harassment was primarily a problem for women, that it rarely happened to men, therefore it should be viewed as a form of sex discrimination. Viewing sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination would make available to victims of sexual harassment the same legal

protection available to victims of sexual discrimination. In November of 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued guidelines that defined sexual harssment as sex discrimination. These guidelines were consistent with MacKinnon's position in that sexual harassment became a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The EEOC guidelines included a definition of sexual harassment as:

> "Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (2) Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment." (29 CRF, Chapter XIV, 1604.11)

The guidelines also stressed that employers should take preventive actions to eliminate sexual harassment. Recommendations of preventive measures included: discussions of sexual harassment; the expression of strong disapproval; development of appropriate sanctions for harassers; and the dispersment of information to employees concerning the rights to raise and how to raise the issue of sexual harassment under EEOC guidelines.

With raised consciousness concerning this social problem editors began compiling books on sexual harassment in the workplace (e.g. Neugarten and Shafritz, 1980). The research community also began empirical work in this area. In 1981, several projects dealing with the issue of sexual harassment, its prevalence and its consequences were published. One such study was completed by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) which examined sexual harassment in the federal workplace. This was a very large scale questionnaire survey that utilized a national sample of 23,964 female and male federal employees. The results of their survey were astounding. The Merit Board estimated a loss of $189 million in the two-year study period (due to job turnover, absenteeism, reduced work productivity, and medical insurance claims) resulting from sexual harassment of federal employees (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB), 1981). However, the results concerning the victims of sexual harassment were sobering. Of the women respondents, 42% reported experiencing sexual harassment on the job and 29% of these victims reported that harassment had had an adverse effect on their psychological well-being.

Another empirically based study of sexual harassment examined the experiences of the Los Angeles County labor force (Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacher, and Russell, 1980; Gutek and Morasch, 1982; Gutek, 1981; Gutek, forthcoming). Telephone interviews were conducted with a representative sample of working men and women in Los Angeles County. Results of this

sample also yielded a high incidence of sexual harassment on the job. Based on the results of the surveys, Gutek concluded that up to 53% of women had been sexually harassed sometime in their working lives. Gutek (1981) also found concrete evidence of negative effects of sexual harassment on the work lives of victims. Thirty-one percent of the women in this sample had either been fired, quit a job, asked for a transfer, quit applying for a job, or talked to someone as a result of sexual harassment.

In 1984, with the support, help and sponsorship of the Sexual Harassment in Employment (S.H.E.) Project of the California Commission on the Status of Women and the California State Employees Association, Claremont Graduate School conducted a large survey of a sample of California civil service workers using mail questionnaires. An emphasis was placed on employees' perceptions of work-related and personal consequences of sexual harassment. The questionnaire also inquired about state personnel complaint procedures for sexual harassment as to their availability to employees and their effectiveness in dealing with instances of harassment.

This joint survey is only a part of a larger project concerned with obtaining and disseminating information about sexual harassment in the workplace. This effort, directed by Mary T. Lebrato, has been named the S.H.E. (Sexual Harassment in Employment) Project. The results of the survey portion of this project are presented in this report. It is the hope of

all of us involved in this effort that this information will be useful in educating legislators, employers, and employees about sexual harassment and its effects upon the workplace.

With an increasing number of women entering the workforce, it has become important to examine the ways in which men and women interact at work. It is an unfortunate but very real fact that sexual harassment has become a part of this interaction. Sexual harassment needs to be addressed in the research community as well as the media. But more importantly this issue needs to be addressed by legislators and employers for it is only through their efforts that sexual harassment in the workforce can be eliminated.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. SUBJECTS

The California State Employees Association (CSEA) participated in selecting the sample of state employees who would receive the questionnaire. CSEA represents the largest union of civil service workers in California. Their membership at the time of the sampling was approximately 90,480 or 77% of the 118,000 total full-time state civil service workers. Demographic information provided by CSEA concerning state job categories and bargaining units was used to select a sample similar to the California civil service workforce. Statistical data revealed that job categories falling into Bargaining Unit 1 were the most similar in three major areas. First, the distribution of gender in Unit 1 was approximately equal to that of the total state workforce (44% female and 56% male). In regard to ethnicity, the percentages of minority groups within Unit 1 were approximately equal to percentages for the total state workforce. Also, Unit 1 represents approximately 27,500 state employees making it one of the largest bargaining units within CSEA. The two major job categories falling into Unit 1 are "professional" and "administrative staff-non supervisory." The statistical data for these job categories (Unit 1) are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

The subject group was comprised of 6,000 state employees randomly selected by computer from Unit 1 of CSEA in January of 1984. The subject group included 3,224 female employees, 2,637 male employees, and 139 employees whose gender was not designated. The sample included full-time as well as part-time state employees. Other characteristics of this subject group are compared to the people who filled out the questionnaire (respondents) in Section III of this report.

B. QUESTIONNAIRE

A 177 item, 14 page questionnaire was developed by Barbara A. Gutek and Vera Dunwoody-Miller of Claremont Graduate School (CGS). Major areas covered by the questionnaire included:

---how each employee defines behaviors which may potentially be viewed as sexual harassment

---departmental policies and complaints processes in regard to sexual harassment

---work-related and personal consequences of sexual

harassment

---possible actions available to employees and effectiveness of these actions in regard to sexual harassment

---general demographic and employment information about the employee

A special section was also included for employees who believed themselves to be victims of sexual harassment while employed by the State of California. Comments were solicited from the S.H.E. Project and CSEA and the survey was modified where needed.

The modified draft of the survey was mailed to 50 state civil service workers in California randomly selected by computer from Bargaining Unit 3 of CSEA. This unit is comprised of teachers and instructional staff. This pre-test sample of subjects was asked to complete the survey and make comments about the construction of the questionnaire and its items. Approximately 50% of the sample of Unit 3 employees returned the questionnaire. Many constructive comments were received and several modifications were made as a result of the pre-test. A copy of the questionnaire can be obtained by writing the authors in care of Claremont Graduate School.

C. PROCEDURE

The questionnaire was mailed from CSEA offices in Sacramento to the sample of 6,000 CSEA Unit 1 members in late January, 1984. Each questionnaire packet included instructions and a pre-paid return envelope addressed to Claremont Graduate School. Each respondent was instructed to complete the survey and return it as soon as possible. Since the questionnaires contained no identifying information, respondents remained anonymous. Postcards that served to remind respondents to participate or thank them if they alreadly had returned the completed survey were intended to be mailed several weeks later, but they were inadvertantly mailed three days after the surveys, sometimes arriving prior to receipt of the survey. [We discuss the possible ramifications of this error in Section X of this report.]

A total of 1,189 surveys were returned to the Claremont Graduate School; this return represents a 20% response rate. Given the length of the questionnaire, the lack of tangible reward for completion, the level of resources available for this project, and the follow-up postcard mailing problem described above, the response rate is considered satisfactory. It is too low, however to generalize the findings from the survey to all state employees in Unit 1. Nonetheless, the study can shed light on the relative importance of the issues addressed in the questionnaire. We compare characteristics of the sample of respondents to those of the employees in Unit 1 in Section III of this report.

Of those surveys returned, 38 were rejected leaving 1,151 for analysis and inclusion in this report. Reasons for rejecting questionnaires were: returned completely blank; several major sections were left blank; the collator inadvertently omitted full pages of the questionnaire; the survey was not "seriously" completed such that rude comments were written over the questionnaire and/or cover letter. The number of surveys that were actually analyzed represented 19% of the surveys distributed to CSEA Unit 1 employees.

Coding of the returned surveys and the analysis of the final data were handled by Dunwoody-Miller of CGS. Descriptive analysis reported herein include results concerning demographic characteristics of all respondents; employees' definitions of what incidents constitute sexual harassment; possible actions available to employees and their effectiveness in regard to sexual harassment; frequency and types of sexual interactions in the workplace; demographic characteristics of respondents who report being sexually harassed as a state civil service employee; and the consequences (work-related and personal) of sexual harassment.. There is a bibliography of the research of note in the area of sexual harassment presented in Section XI.

III. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL RESPONDENTS

A. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Gender

A total of 1,151 employees returned correctly completed questionnaires to Claremont Graduate School in Claremont, California. Of those respondents indicating their gender, 758 (65.9%) were female, 367 (31.9%) were male and 26 (2.3%) of the respondents did not indicate their gender. As of March 1982, the gender ratio for all full-time state civil service workers was 44.3% female and 55.7% male. Therefore female state workers are over-represented and male state workers are under-represented. This is somewhat expected due to the nature of this topic. Sexual harassment has traditionally been more of a concern for women than for men in the workplace. (The Merit System Protection Board Survey of sexual harassment in the federal workplace also received higher response rates from women than men [Johnson, personal communication, Aug, 1984].)

Ethnicity

The majority of respondents (73.4%) were white. The second largest ethnic category was Hispanic which comprised 9.7% of the respondents. Comparison of the ethnicity of the survey respondents to the total state workforce as of March, 1982

reveals that black employees were under-represented in the final sample and white employees were slightly over-represented. Representation of all other ethnic groups is very close to the actual state workforce according to the ethnicity statistics from 1982. These data are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Age

Only 3% of the sample was under 25 years of age. The majority of female and male respondents classified themselves in the 35-44 year age range (33.9% and 31.6% respectively). The data for age of survey respondents are presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

Marital Status

The largest overall category was "married" with 58.6% of the respondents checking this category. However, when broken down by gender, male respondents (66.8%) were more likely to be married than female respondents (54.6%). For the divorced category the opposite was found. Female respondents (22%) were much more likely to be divorced or separated than the male respondents (10.4%). Data on the marital status of the survey

respondents are presented in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

Education

The survey respondents as a whole were well-educated with "some college or trade school" and "BA or equivalent" being the largest categories (34.9% and 39.3% respectively.) Male respondents reported more education than female respondents. The percentage for male respondents with a BA or higher degree was 78.5% while for female respondents it was only 50.1%. Table 5 contains the education data for the survey respondents.

Insert Table 5 about here

B. OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Occupation

Eleven occupational categories were included in the questionnaire. Each category offered two or three job titles and the employee was instructed to mark the category that best described her or his current job. The category that represented the largest number of respondents was "analyst/auditor" (31.3%). This category also included the largest percentage of men (36.2%) and women (29%).

These categories were taken from job listings of CSEA Unit 1 employees. Job categories contained in Unit 1 cover approximately 22.9% of jobs in the total state civil service workforce. The respondents primarily represent an urban intregrated office workforce with the majority of respondents being white, well-educated and middle-class and are therefore not representative of the total state workforce. However, this group of employees was not chosen to be representative on the basis of salary and occupation. They are representative of the total state workforce on the basis of gender (number of male and female employees represented) and on ethnicity proportions. The totals for the job categories are presented in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

An unusual feature of Table 6 is the relative sex-integration of the job categories listed. Most job categories either represent many more men than women or many more women than men (Nieva and Gutek, 1981). None of the job categories contained in Unit 1 have a highly skewed sex-ratio. Among the more skewed are planner/inspector (almost twice as many men as women) and interviewer/intern/student assistant (over twice as many women as men.)

A separate question asked if the respondent was a supervisor who gave performance ratings to other employees. Only 8.7% of the survey respondents answered in the affirmative. Of those respondents who stated they were supervisors, 51% were female, 46% were male and 3% did not state their gender. This result was expected in that most of Unit 1 are rank and file employees. Managers and supervisors are primarily non-represented employees so this small percentage of supervisors among the respondents is appropriate.

Length of Employment at Current Job

The majority of respondents designated the 1-3 years category for length of time at their current job (33.5%). However when this variable is cross-tabulated by gender some interesting differences are found. For the female respondents the largest category for length of time at current job was "1-3 years" (37.2%). For the male respondents the category containing the most respondents (27%) was "10yrs and up".

There are no statistics available for all state workers as to how often they change jobs. The data for length of employment at current job are presented in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 about here

Current Work Schedule

The majority of the respondents (77.9%) reported that they are permanent, full-time state employees. This was followed by permanent part-time employees (13.9%). Since the bulk of state civil service workers are full-time employees and hired on a permanent basis, the respondent sample is similar to the state workforce. Not surprisingly, women are less likely than men to be full-time, permanent employees. The actual work schedule data for the respondents are presented in Table 8.

Insert Table 8 about here

County of Current Job

Counties were sampled on the basis of how many state civil service workers were employed in that county. Therefore, large metropolitan areas such as Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Francisco were sent the largest number of surveys and yielded the largest number of returned questionnaires. The data

prsented in Table 9 include the number of surveys sent to each county in California, the number received from each county, and the return rate. Return rates by county varied from 0% to 66%. Counties receiving few questionnaires tended to have a broader range of response rates. The counties receiving the largest numbers of questionnaires had response rates between 16% and 22%.

Insert Table 9 about here

Length of Employment at This Type of Work and as a State Employee

The respondents most often indicated that they had been doing their present line of work for 10 years or longer (37.2%). Almost half of the men (49.3%) and 30.9% of the women were in their present line of work for 10 years or longer.

The majority of the respondents have also been long time state civil service employees. The 10 years or longer category represented 45.9% of the respondents (42.9% of the women and 52.6% of the men.) Information on length of employment and type of work is presented in Table 10.

Insert Table 10 about here

Salary

Respondents were asked to indicate their yearly salary at their state civil service position in one of five categories. The category most often chosen by female respondents was "$20,000 to $29,999". This category represented 50.8% of these respondents. The category of "$30,000 to $49,999" represented 40.3% of the male respondents, followed closely by 39.8% in the "$20,000 to $29,999" category. Salary information is presented in Table 11.

Insert Table 11 about here

The interesting fact here is the gender difference of those employees earning $20,000 a year or more. For the female rspondents, 58.1% earn $20,000 or more while 80.6% of the male respondents have this distinction. Because these statistics are for all respondents, full-time as well as part-time workers an analysis of salary for full-time workers only was run. The earning discrepancy was still present. Men earning $20,000 a year and more for full-time civil service work comprised 88.8% of the respondents. Female workers who were employed full-time with the state civil service and earned $20,000 or more comprised only 74.6% of the respondents. Even more discrepant are the figures for $30,000 and above. Whereas 44.8% of the men make $30,000 and more per year, only 9.3% of the women in this sample do. This gender difference exists despite the other

statistics that indicate male and female respondents hold approximately the same job classifications and have been state workers for approximately the same length of time. The one factor for this sample that may help account for this salary difference is length of time at current job. For female respondents the largest category was 1-3 years at their current job. For males the largest category was 10 years and up.

IV. DEFINITIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The questionnaire presented several incidents that may occur in the workplace and asked the respondent to indicate whether or not she or he generally considered the behavior described in the incident to be sexual harassment at work. This was followed by the EEOC definition of sexual harassment. The respondents were also asked their opinion of this definition of harassment. The opinion was indicated by the choice of one of four answers (disagree strongly; disagree somewhat; agree somewhat; agree strongly.)

The use of the method of "respondents" defining sexual harassment rather than the "researchers" presenting their definition enables assessment of how the workers actually perceive "sexual harassment" in their places of employment. This technique should lead to a better understanding of other related results such as low rates of reporting of sexual harassment, potential misunderstanding of the issue, and personal and work-related consequences of sexual harassment.

A OPINIONS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS OF THE EEOC DEFINITION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The majority, 75.8%, of the respondents agreed strongly with the EEOC definition of sexual harassment. However, more of the female respondents strongly agreed with the definition than did the male respondents (80.3% vs. 66.2% respectively.) The male respondents were more likely to only agree somewhat when compared to the female respondents (25.6% vs. 13.2% respectively.) Less than seven percent of the respondents disagreed (somewhat and strongly) with the EEOC definition. According to this sample, the EEOC definition adequately appears to cover sexual harassment in the state workplace. Table 12 provides more complete information on the attitudes of employees concerning the EEOC definition.

Insert Table 12 about here

B INCIDENTS THAT CONSTITUTE SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Eight incidents that might occur in the workplace were presented. The respondents were instructed to indicate if the particular incident: "is sexual harassment"; "is not sexual harassment"; or "didn't know/not sure". The eight incidents were:

---sexual relations as part of the job

---dating as part of the job

---incidents of sexual touching at work

---sexual looks/gestures that are meant to be insulting

---sexual looks/gestures that were meant to be complimentary

---sexual comments that are meant to be insulting

---sexual comments that are meant to be complimentary

---receiving uninvited letters, phone calls, gifts of a sexual nature

The data for female vs. male respondents' opinions concerning each incident are presented in Table 13

Insert Table 13 about here

For all of the eight incidents, substantial percentages of respondents indicated that each incident was sexual harassment. For all but two of the incidents the total percentage of "yes, is sexual harassment" answers was over 80%. The two incidents that fell below all others in percentages of yes answers were actions that were of a sexual yet complimentary nature. While they were seen as sexual harassment by a majority of respondents a large percentage of respondents were unsure if these incidents were actually harassment.

Another interesting result is that women were more likely than men to indicate each incident as sexual harassment. The average percentage of "yes" answers for female respondents was 82% and for male respondents was 72%. The difference between mens' and womens' responses may be attributed to at least two factors: 1) Men were less likely than women to agree that sexual comments, looks, or gestures intended to be complimentary were harassment; 2) Men were more likely than women to indicate that they didn't know or weren't sure that the incidents were harassment. The percentages of respondents answering "no, is not sexual harassment" were low for all eight incidents.

V. THE WORKPLACE

Several sections of the questionnaire dealt with the current workplace of the respondent. They were asked about the degree of sexual harassment, complaint channels and policies concerning sexual harassment in their departments, the most effective actions supervisors could take to eliminate harassment, actions available to employees who have been sexually harassed as well as employees' projected actions concerning harassment in the workplace.

The State of California, through the State Personnel Board, has a discrimination complaint process for any state worker who has been sexually harassed. Each department is mandated to make available and inform all employees of this process. Through the use of a variety of questions concerning the respondents' workplace one hope was to ascertain the degree of knowledge about the discrimination complaint process and its availability.

Several other sections of the questionnaire allowed employees to express their opinions on what best could be done to end sexual harassment in the workplace. The responses to all of the above questions are discussed below.

A. SEXUAL HARASSMENT: HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS IT?

Respondents were asked, "How much of a problem at your place of work do you consider sexual harassment to be?". The majority of respondents indicated it was no problem (64.4%) Of those respondents indicating it was a minor problem (29.5% of the total sample) slightly more were female (31.3%; males, 26.4%). There were equal percentages of males and females who believed sexual harassment to be a major problem at their place of work (4.6% and 4.9% respectively). While this percentage, 64.4% indicating harassment is not a problem at their workplaces, is encouraging---there still remains 34.4%, over one-third, of the respondents who indicated it was a problem. As long as sexual harassment is a problem for any worker steps need to be taken to eliminate it from the workplace.

Insert Table 14 about here

B. DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES REGARDING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

All departments in the state civil service are mandated by law to have a policy against sexual harassment which should be readily available to all employees. Employees were asked directly about their awareness of a departmental policy in regard to sexual harassment. Somewhat more than half--54.3% of the respondents--said "yes they were aware of such a policy." Of the remaining respondents, 25.6% indicated there was no such policy in their departments and 18.9% said they didn't know of any policy in this regard. These results are shown in Table 15.

Insert Table 15 about here

For those respondents indicating that their department did have a policy in regard to sexual harassment, a question concerning effectiveness was asked. They were asked to indicate in which of six areas the policy is effective. These areas are:

---defining sexual harassment

---educating employees about their rights to a harassment free environment

---educating employees about informal actions to curtail harassment

---educating employees about formal actions to curtail harassment

---informing employees about potential consequences

for the harasser

---informing employees about additional complaint options

Information about effectiveness of policies is contained in Table 16.

Insert Table 16 about here

The majority of respondents (who knew that their departments have policies) indicated that the policy in regard to sexual harassment was effective in most of the six areas. However, for two of the categories the policies were rated as not effective by more than half of the respondents. These two categories are: informing employees about potential consequences for the "harasser" and informing employees about additional complaint options.

Respondents were most likely to report that the policies are effective in defining harassment and in educating employees about their rights. In general, men and women were similar in their evaluation of the effectiveness of the policies. The largest difference (twelve percentage points) was with respect to informing employees about the potential consequences for the harasser. Women were less likely than men to feel that the policies are effective in this regard.

Only about a tenth of the people who know that their department has a sexual harassment policy reported that it is effective in all areas. Men, more than women, reported that the policies are totally ineffective.

Respondents were also asked to rate the effectiveness of the policy in directly eliminating or lessening sexual harassment directly. The most frequent response (28.5%) to this question was that it was not applicable because there had been no sexual harassment before or after the policy was adopted. Of those indicating a degree of effectiveness, the largest response category was "somewhat effective" representing 16.3% of the responses to this questions.

Another question related to departmental policies regarding sexual harassment referred to knowledge of sexual harassment seminars or awareness training for employees. The majority of respondents (56.1%) indicated that, since beginning their current job, their department had NOT held such a seminar or training program. Of those respondents who indicated that their departments had held a seminar or training session, 26.5% said they had attended and 12.4% said they were unable to attend. Several respondents who said they were unable to attend indicated on the questionnaire that the seminars had been for supervisors only.

The respondents who indicated that a seminar or training had been held were asked to rate the effectivenss of the seminar. These ratings were the same six effectiveness areas that were addressed in the policy question (please refer to previous page.) Information about the seminars' effectiveness is presented in Table 17.

Insert Table 17 about here

The area of greatest perceived effectiveness of the seminar or training was educating employees about their rights (57% of those respondents who indicated that their department had had such a seminar or training). Women were more likely than men to regard training as effective in this area. The areas of least effectiveness were the same as those indicated in the policy effectiveness question: informing employees about potential consequences for the "harasser" and informing employees about additional complaint options. Women were likely to rate the programs as less effective than men in both of these areas.

Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the seminar or training session in the elimination of sexual harassment within their departments. The category representing the largest number of respondents (answering the effectiveness question) was, as for the policy question, "not applicable", because there had been no sexual harassment within their departments prior to or after the training. Of those indicating

a degree of effectiveness, the largest response category was "somewhat effective". Only about 5% of the people whose departments had some training on sexual harassment reported that the seminar was totally ineffective.

C. DEPARTMENTAL COMPLAINT PROCESSES REGARDING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Several questions were related to knowledge concerning complaint procedures for incidents of sexual harassment. One question directly asked the respondent if his or her department had developed a discrimination complaint process for sexual harassment. Since all state civil service departments are mandated to inform employees of the existing complaint procedures, a lack of knowledge on the part of the employee suggests that some changes are necessary. While a majority (52%) of the respondents indicated that their departments do have such a complaint process--39.5% of the respondents indicated they didn't know and 8% said no such process exists within their departments. This clearly points to a lack of information in this regard among state employees.

In order to ascertain how the "informed" respondents became aware of the complaint process within their departments, a question with the following seven options was included

Employees were asked to mark as many options as applied to their INITIAL awareness of the process:

---received a written copy without request

---received a written copy upon request

---told about it by a co-worker

---told about it by a supervisor

---department seminar

---written copy was posted in work area

Respondents' answers in each of these areas is presented in Table 18.

Insert Table 18 about here

Table 18 shows that the majority of "informed" employees became informed by receiving a written copy of the department's complaint processes without having to request it. Others learned about it through seminars or films or heard about it from their supervisor or co-worker. Less than 20% said they saw a written copy posted in their work area.

Another area of employee was knowledge of "counselors" or "designates." All state civil service employees should have access to "counselors" that are knowledgable in the area of employment issues. These counselors or designates are supposed to be chosen within each department and given special training in areas such as job discrimination, wage disputes, supervisor-employee relations, sexual harassment, etc.

Respondents were asked if, within their departments, they were aware of a designated departmental counselor for sexual harassment issues. An overwhelming majority of the respondents, 61.4%, said no. Of the remaining respondents, 21.5% indicated yes and 16% said they did not know. This raises the question of whether the counselors are not being designated or whether the employees are simply not informed.

Of those respondents (N=452) answering the question," Would you go to this person (designated counselor) for help if you felt you were being sexually harassed at your job?", over half (52.7%) indicated that they would go to this person for help. There was a large gender difference, with 59.3% of the women as compared to 39% of the men indictaed yes to this question. The majority of men (36.8%) said they didn't know if they would go to this person for help, with only 25.7% of the females so indicating. Of those respondents who indicated "no", 19.1% were men and 12.1% were female.

Another area of the questionnaire dealt with perceptions of departmental policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment by posing "what if" situations. Respondents were asked to rate the likelihood of occurance of five different events, if they, themselves, were being sexually harassed and filed a complaint. The possible answers were: very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, and not at all likely. The five events and results for the "very likely" response category are presented in Table 19.

Insert Table 19 about here

The majority of the respondents indicated that it was very likely or somewhat likely that their departments and/or supervisors would enforce policies regarding sexual harassment (74%), would care about their feelings (74.1%), and would carry out a thorough investigation of the complaint (74.8%). However, when asked about the "swiftness" of the complaint process the respondents' answers were mixed. Over one-third of the respondents still indicated that a swift complaint process is somewhat likely (36.1%) but 31.3% of the respondents indicated it is "not very likely." In general, mens' and womens' answers to these questions are very similar.

The responses to the question regarding possible retaliation for a complaint also yielded interesting results. While most employees seemed satisfied with the handling of harassment complaints (as indicated by the previous question), they are not completely sure of the consequences, i.e. the degree of retaliation. The largest group of respondents (32.9%) indicated retaliation was not very likely, however 27.9% believe it was somewhat likely. Only 15.2% of the respondents indicate retaliation was not at all likely while 18.6% (20.7% women and 13.9% men) believe it was very likely.

Respondents were asked to express their opinions on what a supervisor's and/or administrator's most effective actions would be in regard to sexual harassment. A list of nine possible actions was included. Respondents were instructed to check any or all actions they believed would be effective to eliminate harassment at work. Results are presented in Table 20.

Insert Table 20 about here

Only 2.3% of the respondents believed that there was very little supervisors could do to reduce sexual harassment on the job. Out of the eight possible actions that supervisors/administrators might employ, seven of them won overwhelming support from the respondents (percentages ranged

from 66.2% to 80.5%). The action that was the most strongly endorsed by both male and female employees was to conduct a swift and thorough investigation of complaints of sexual harassment. The only one that was not supported by a majority of the respondents was establishment of a special counseling service for those who experience sexual harassment (49.3% indicated that it would be an effective action.)

D. POSSIBLE ACTIONS AVAILABLE WITHIN DEPARTMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE BEEN SEXUALLY HARASSED AND THE PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ACTIONS

A section of the questionnaire listed seven possible actions that should be available to all state civil service workers who have been sexually bothered or harassed by others at work. All of these actions were adopted in early 1976 by the State Personnel Board and should be available to all state employees. Respondents were asked to indicate if each action was available where they work. They were also instructed to rate the effectiveness of the action in helping harassed workers. Partial data for the seven items indicating perceived availability and ratings of effectiveness are presented in Table 21.

Insert Table 21 about here

The two most available actions according to the responses given by the survey respondents were: 1) requesting an investigation by his or her department; and 2) filing a discrimination complaint within his or her department. However, when respondents rated perceived effectiveness of these items they were not as highly rated. In fact, most actions were rated relatively low in effectiveness. This is unfortunate in that if employees view their most available actions as only somewhat effective they are not likely to actively pursue these actions

The other disconcerting result was the high percentage of employees who don't know if the course of action is available or not. According to these data, state employees are not aware of their "rights", rights which are explicitly stated in the State Discrimination Complaint Process (1976). There is definitely a lack of information concerning this process. There is also the perception among employees who do know of the process that it is ineffective in dealing with the problem.

E. EMPLOYEES' PROJECTED ACTIONS CONCERNING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Section VII of the survey listed some possible options or actions a person might take if she or he felt sexually harassed at work regardless of whether or not the action was formally available as discussed above. Each subject was asked to project which actions she or he would take if sexually harassed at work by choosing one of the three following responses: 1) would take; 2) might take; or 3) would not take that particular action/option. The rank ordering and corresponding percentage of each action/ option that male and female respondents indicated they "would take" are presented in Table 22.

Insert Table 22 about here

The action that yielded the highest percentage in the "would take" answer category was " ask or tell the person to stop." However, more women indicated (86.7%) they would take this action than men (78.7%). The results yielded greater percentages of men indicating "might take" to more action/options than did women.

The three top answers in the "would take" category for both men and women were: ask or tell person to stop (78.7% and 86.7%, respectively), document the complaint/incident (77.7% and 83.5%, respectively) and, report the behavior to a supervisor (55.6% and 72.8%, respectively). For those actions that dealt with actual filing of complaints, 54.9% of the respondents said they would file a complaint within their

department and 36.8% indicated they might take this action. Also, 42.2% said they would file a grievance with their union and another 39.6% said they might take this action. When this is compared to what the victims report the results are quite different. What the victims actually reported doing was "ignoring the behavior" followed by "avoiding the person". What people say they would do in a harassment situation and what is actually done appear to be quite different according to these survey results. Another interesting point is that very few people said they would quit a job if they were sexually harassed yet 10% of women have quit a job due to harassment sometime in their worklives.

department and 36.8% indicated they might take this action. Also, 42.2% said they would file a grievance with their union and another 39.6% said they might take this action. When this is compared to what the victims report the results are quite different. What the victims actually reported doing was "ignoring the behavior" followed by "avoiding the person". What people say they would do in a harassment situation and what is actually done appear to be quite different according to these survey results. Another interesting point is that very few people said they would quit a job if they were sexually harassed yet 10% of women have quit a job due to harassment sometime in their worklives.

VI. FREQUENCY AND TYPES OF SEXUAL INTERACTIONS IN THE WORKPLACE

Interactions of all types occur between workers on a daily basis. It is when these interactions are of a sexual nature and unwanted that sexual harassment can be construed. Other studies of sexual harassment show that the more "sexualized" the work environment--the more likely sexual harassment is to occur.

In Section III of the questionnaire, respondents were asked about their personal experiences with a number of sexual situations that might occur at work, during their employment by the State of California. They were not necessarily meant to be viewed as "harassment" situations, as often these incidents are between consenting adults. It was the intention of this section to catalog the type, prevalence, and frequency of various sexual interactions in the state civil service workplace and to determine the "sexual nature" of the work environment. Also toward this goal, respondents were asked if anyone they knew experienced any of the listed sexual interactions while employed as a state worker. The results for the respondents and those state employees known to them are presented in the next two sections of this report.

A. PERSONAL EXPERIENCES OF RESPONDENTS

Nine situations, ranging from being the recipient of sexual remarks to being expected to engage in sexual relations as part of one's job, were presented in one section of the questionnaire. For each situation the respondent was asked if it had occurred to him or her while employed in state civil service. If the answer was "yes", they were instructed to indicate the frequency of occurence (somewhat infrequently, somewhat frequently, or very frequently.) The results for each situation are presented in Table 23.

Insert Table 23 about here

As the situations become more severe the number of respondents indicating that they have had that experience declines. For the categories that would be considered more severe such as "sexual relations as part of the job" and/or "dating as part of the job" the percentages of 'yes' answers were 3.5% and 6.4%, respectively. However, in the less severe categories such as compliments and/or looks and gestures of a sexual nature the percentages are much higher (68.7% and 60% answering 'yes', respectively). As expected, the majority of those who indicate they have had these experiences while employed by the state are women. For every incident presented,

higher percentages of female respondents than male respondents answered in the affirmative than male respondents. Consistent with other research findings, women are more often a target for sexual interactions--complimentary or harassing--in the workplace.

B. EXPERIENCES IN THE WORKPLACE OF OTHERS KNOWN TO RESPONDENTS

Nine experiences (the same nine as in preceding Section A) of a sexual nature that might occur in the workplace were presented to the respondents who were asked to indicate if anyone they knew had had that particular experience at work. They were also asked if the person known to them was a state employee at the time of the experience.

Approximately 45% of the respondents indicated that a person they knew had received, "sexual remarks that were meant to be complimentary." The second most commonly reported experience (39%) of a person known to the respondent was: " sexual looks or gestures of a sexual nature that were meant to be complimentary." This experience was followed closely in percentage by "anyone you know the target of sexual jokes at their workplace?". In answer to this question 32% of all respondents said yes and stated that the person was a state

employee at the time.

The less "harassing' experiences are more common while the more "harassing" behaviors seem to occur in private rather than in public view. Still 22% of the women and 27% of the men stated that they knew someone who was asked to engage in sexual relations as part of the job (less than half of those involved were state employees.) Results for all nine situations are presented in Table 24.

Insert Table 24 about here

VII. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SEXUALLY HARASSED RESPONDENTS

The results in this section describe responses of 213 state employees who completed the section designated for those who felt they had been sexually harassed at work. They represent approximately 18.5% of the total sample.

A. Personal Characteristics

Gender

Of the 213 respondents completing this section of the questionnaire, 189 were women (88.7%), 20 were men (9.4%) and 4 respondents did not indicate their gender (1.9%). A review of the open-ended comments made by these respondents revealed that approximately half of the twenty male respondents indicated that they were sexually harassed by other men and one woman offered that her harassment was from another woman.

Ethnicity

The ethnicity percentages for sexually harassed respondents is somewhat different from the ethnicity distribution of the total sample of respondents. This comparative data are

presented in Table 25. In all ethnic categories, except Asian and white, higher percentages were obtained than would be predicted by the survey totals. The conclusion that minority women appear to endure more sexual harassment than their white co-workers is suggested by these results.

Insert Table 25 about here

AGE

All age categories were represented by respondents reporting sexual harassment. The largest category for female as well as male victims was the 35-44 year age range (46.6% and 45%, respectively). This category (35-44 year age range) also represented the most survey respondents. The categories of 45-54 years and 55 years or older were under-represented by respondents reporting sexual harassment while the 25-34 year and 35-44 year age ranges were over-represented among the victim group when compared to the age data for all respondents. The data for age of those respondents reporting sexual harassment are presented in Table 26.

Insert Table 26 about here

Marital Status

The majority of all respondents (58.6%) reported being married. For those respondents reporting sexual harassment the single most representative category was also 'married' (44.6%). However, most of the victims were not married. The combined categories of 'single', 'divorced/separated' and 'widowed' equals 56.1% of the female victims. This result did not occur for the male respondents reporting sexual harassment. The results for all marital status categories are presented in Table 27.

Insert Table 27 about here

Educational Level

All education levels were represented by the respondents reporting sexual harassment. The majority of the respondents reported earning a B.A. degree (42.3%). This category represented the majority of women (40.7%) and men (55%). The graduate work educational categories represented approximately equal percentages of men and women. However, those categories of 'some college' or below were over-represented among the female victims in comparison to the educational data for all respondents. All of the male victims stated that they had at least some college or a degree. The results for educational level of the respondents reporting sexual harassment are presented in Table 28.

Insert Table 28 about here

B. OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Occupation

All occupations within Unit 1 were represented among the respondents. The percentages for each set of occupations were approximately equal to the percentages for the total respondent sample. The most representative set of jobs was, again, analyst/auditor (31.7%) but only for the female victim respondents. The largest number of male respondents (30%) reporting harassment indicated they were in the specialist/consultant job category. The results for all job categories are presented in Table 29.

Insert Table 29 about here

Length of Time employed at Current State Job of Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment

The category of 1-3 years as a state employee represented a greater percentage (40.8%) of respondents reporting sexual harassment than of the total sample (33.5%). Female victims of harassment were clustered in this 1-3 years range (43.9%) while

male victims were clustered in the 10 years and over (35%) and the 4-6 years (35%) categories. Information on length of employment at current state job for those reporting sexual harassment is contained in Table 30.

Insert Table 30 about here

Length of All Employment For State of California

The category of 10 years and over represented the majority of male (50%) and female (43.4%) respondents reporting sexual harassment. This was also the largest category for all respondents (45.9%). All categories of length of employment for the State of California were represented among those reporting harassment as shown in Table 31.

Insert Table 31 about here

Salary

Salary levels for those reporting sexual harassment were somewhat lower than the total sample of respondents. A larger percentage (59.2%) of the victims were in the $20,000 to $29,999 per year salary category (total percentage respondents in this category was 47.1). Women reporting harassment were more represented by the lower salary categories than men.

Information concerning salary level for these respondents is presented in Table 32.

Insert Table 32 about here

VIII. CLASSIFICATION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY VICTIMS

Respondents were instructed to complete this section ONLY if they felt they had been sexually harassed at work. If they had experienced unwanted sexual attention at their state workplace, they were asked to select one experience and answer that section of the questionnaire in terms of that one experience. First, respondents were asked to classify the experience they had chosen. They were then asked to indicate what actions they had taken in regard to their harassment and the outcome of those actions. Twenty one possible actions were offered to the respondents. The outcome categories were: 'situation improved'; 'made no difference'; 'situation got worse' and 'not sure'. Other questions inquired about responses of management to complaints or why a complaint had not been filed, and about familiarity with the complaint process both at the time of the harassment and at the time of completion the questionnaire.

A. CLASSIFICATION

Respondents completing the section for sexual harassment victims were asked to classify the experience they had selected to describe on the questionnaire. Four classifications were offered and respondents were instructed to mark all answers that applied to their experience. The four categories can be summarized as: 'only experience'; 'most recent experience'; 'experience that had the greatest effect'; and 'experience is still continuing'. The classification marked by the greatest number of respondents was "experience that had the greatest effect" (37.6%). The results for all four classifications are displayed in Table 33.

Insert Table 33 about here

B. ACTIONS TAKEN AND OUTCOME OF ACTIONS

Of the twenty-one actions listed, only three had been taken by a majority of the victims. These three actions were: 1)'ignore the behavior' (73.7%); 2) 'avoid the person' (69%); and 3) 'ask or tell the person(s) to stop' (57.3%). For the first two actions the majority of those who had taken them indicated the action had made 'no difference'. For the third

action (asking the person to stop), a majority of the respondents indicated the 'situation improved' When the actions entailed actually filing a complaint, telling a supervisor, documenting the complaint, etc. the percentages fell well below 50%. The rank ordering and results for the five most common actions and are presented in Table 34.

Insert Table 34 about here

Other actions were used by very few people. For example, only 8.5% asked for an investigation, 6.6% talked with an EEO/AA designate, and only 8.9% sought professional counseling to help them cope with stress caused by sexual harassment. In sum, most victims tended to go it alone.

C. REASONS FOR ACTIONS/RESPONSE OF DEPARTMENT TO ACTIONS

The victims who indicated they had filed a complaint and/or requested an investigation were asked about the response of their departments' management. Eight response choices were available (please refer to Table 35). The respondents were instructed to mark all responses that applied to their experience. Forty respondents (33 women, 6 men, and one respondent who did not indicate gender) filed a complaint or

asked for an investigation. Thirty-seven percent indicated that their departmental management "did nothing". Fourteen of the 33 women but only one man said that management did nothing in response to the complaint. The second largest response at 32.5% was "found my charge to be true", but only 5% (one out of the six men who complained and one out of the 34 women who complained) said corrective action in their favor (e.g. awarded back pay, promotion, etc.) was taken. Nine women and two men stated that management was hostile or took retaliatory action against them. Results for each response are presented in Table 35.

Insert Table 35 about here

The victims who had not filed a complaint nor asked for an investigation (N=173) were asked why they choose not to act. One hundred and fifty six women, 14 men and 3 people who did not indicate gender were victims but did not file a complaint nor ask for an investigation. These respondents selected any or all of eight reasons (shown in Table 36) offered regarding their decision making process.

Of these eight reasons, the one indicated by the most respondents (50.3%) was, "I thought it would make my work situation unpleasant." The second most common reason (42.8%) was "I did not think anything would be done about it." The third most common reason was "I thought it would be held against me or

I would be blamed" (32.9%). The results for each response are presented in Table 36.

Insert Table 36 about here

Men were much less likely than women to say that reporting the incident would make their work situation unpleasant or that they would be blamed. Men were more likely than women to report that they "saw no need to report" the incident. Female victims indicated that the following actions were most effective in improving their work environment: Transfering (51.9%), asking/telling the person to stop (53.6%) and obtaining professional counseling (56.3%). It is interesting to note that all of these actions are self-motivated rather than actions involving the formal complaint system at work. It does not appear that victims are accessing the formal complaint system due to its perceived ineffectiveness.

D. KNOWLEDGE OF COMPLAINT PROCESS

Respondents who reported being sexually harassed were asked to indicate their knowledge of the complaint process. They were asked about their degree of knowledge at the time of the harassment experience and their current knowledge. At the time of their harassment experiences, respondents reported their familiarity with the complaint process to be quite low. The

majority of the respondents (68.1%) indicated they were not at all familiar with the system and another 22.5% said they were somewhat familiar.

Current familiarity with the complaint process increased greatly over familiarity at the time of harassment. Most of the respondents (46.5%) indicated they were still only somewhat familiar with the process. However, the number respondents indicating high familiarity with the complaint system at the time of harassment (7.5%) had increased (26.3%) at the time of the completion of the survey. Of those who indicated they were not at all familiar (68.1%) at the time of harassment, only 25.8% described themselves as unfamiliar at the time of the completion of the survey. Results for all categories are displayed in Table 37.

Insert Table 37 about here

Respondents indicating at the time of the questionnaire that they were still only somewhat familiar or not at all familiar with the complaint process were asked about factors that might account for their lack of familiarity. The most common response (39.1%) was that the information was not available. Results for each factor are presented in Table 38.

Insert Table 38 about here

IX. CONSEQUENCES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

One of the major concerns of this survey was work-related and personal consequences suffered by victims of sexual harassment. Respondents were asked about consequences of sexual harassment that had been suffered by workers known to them. Here it was our hope to get some indication of the extent to which harassment altered the lives of the victims without asking only victims. Sexual harassment often goes unreported to officials and on questionnaires but many victims may talk to friends or co-workers about the problem. The reports of co-workers and friends as well as those consequences directly reported by the victims on this questionnaire taken together can assist in determining the extent of these consequences better than each measure individually. The consequences of sexual harassment suffered by those known to respondents and those respondents reporting harassment themselves are discussed in the following section.

A. CONSEQUENCES SUFFERED BY PERSON KNOWN TO RESPONDENTS

All respondents were asked if anyone they knew had experienced adverse consequences as a result of sexual harassment at work. They were also asked if these persons known to them were state employees at the time of the sexual harassment. Fourteen possible consequences were presented in Section V of the questionnaire.

The consequence most often reported by the respondent concerning someone they knew was "upset enough to talk to co-worker, friend, or another person about the harassment" (25.5%). The consequences with the next highest percentages dealt with the workplace--such that 18.8% reported,"affected ability to work with harasser" and 16.3% indicated "asked for a transfer or got another job". However, if all of the consequences are taken as a group, the majority of the respondents indicated that no one they knew has suffered these consequences. It should be noted here that in order to know if someone had suffered these consequences one would need to know someone who had been sexually harassed at work. There was no question that specifically asked this, however it appears from the 'sexual interactions at work' questions that not many people even know someone who has been harassed at work. Therefore, it is not surprising that most respondents answered 'no' to this question. A 'no' answer most likely indicates that no one they

know has been harassed, thus, no one they knew had suffered these consequences. The fourteen consequences and the results for each in regard to those state employees known to the respondents are presented in Table 39.

Insert Table 39 about here

B. CONSEQUENCES REPORTED BY SEXUAL HARASSMENT VICTIMS

The consequence response categories were the same in this section as in Section V described above. Respondents indicating that they were sexually harassed at work were asked to indicate what consequences they have suffered as a result of their harassment.

The consequence most often reported (63.2%) was, "the need to tell a co-worker, friend or other person about the harassment experience." This was followed closely by "an affected ability to work with the harasser" (60.8%). Also, 44.8% of these respondents reported "affected ability to perform to full potential at work" as a result of sexual harassment.

Further analyses of these data reveal that as the study victims escalated their complaints (i.e. complaining to the harasser, complaining to the department, complaining to an outside agency) there was a higher probability that the victim

would experience adverse consequences. Thus, as the complaint escalates to higher channels the cost to the victim as well as to the agency increases. The results for consequences suffered by the victims is in Table 40.

Insert Table 40 about here

X. CONSTRAINTS OF THE SURVEY

The present survey represented an unusual collaboration in that three independent organizations were involved: the California State Employees Association (CSEA), the California Commission on the Status of Women's Sexual Harassment in Employment Project (S.H.E.) and two rsearchers at the Claremont Graduate School, Professor Barbara A. Gutek and Vera Dunwoody-Miller. The project, like many of this kind, was short of funds; a comparable commercial venture would have cost at least ten times as much. Nevertheless, many capable and highly experienced people contributed their time and expertise to this project which allowed the project to run on schedule and yield highly useful results.

The main shortcoming of the research is the relatively low response rate. The overall response rate was about 20% which is quite good considering the circumstances. Nevertheless, the response rate is too low to be able to confidently generalize the results of the survey to all state employees. However, the fact that many of the findings reported here are similar to results found among other groups of workers studied by Gutek and others increases our confidence in these findings.

Several factors might have lead to a higher response rate. Had the resources been available to pay respondents, for example, or call the non-respondents to remind them to fill out the questionnaire, the response rate would have been higher.

The questionnaire used in this study was quite lengthy and there was no incentive to fill it out, other than interest and concern about the issue of sexual harasment. Not surprisingly, more women than men returned their completed questionnaires.

Another problem that may have affected the response rate occurred in mailing the follow-up postcards. These follow-up cards, which serve to remind respondents to participate or thank them if they had already returned the survey, were inadvertantly mailed only three days after the questionnaire. Many respondents indicated on the questionnaires that they received the follow-up cards before they received their questionnaires. We feel that this mailing error might have angered some people enough to prevent them from responding.

While the response rate is low enough so that we feel uncomfortable generalizing the results of the survey to all state employees, we are pleased that a large number of people responded. This allows us to relate workers experiences and attitudes to each other which is not affected by the response rate.

XI. BIBLOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

Abbey, A. (1982) Sex differences in attribution for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 42(5), 830-838.

Allen, R. (1975) Men and women together. MH, 59(4), 21-25.

Alliance Against Sexual Coercion (1979) FIGHTING SEXUAL HARASSMENT: AN ADVOCACY HANDBOOK. Cambridge, Mass.: AASC.

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (1982) SEXUAL HARASSMENT: ON-THE-JOB SEXUAL HARASSMENT: WHAT THE UNION CAN DO. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women. (1978) SEXUAL HARASSMENT: A HIDDEN ISSUE. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Backhouse, C. (1981) FIGHTING SEXUAL HARASSMENT. Boston: Alliance Against Sexual Coersion.

Backhouse, C. & Cohen, L. (1978) THE SECRET OPPRESSION: SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WORKING WOMEN. Toronto: MacMillian.

Baldridge, K. & McLean, G. (1980) Sexual harassment: How much of a problem is it...really? JOURNAL OF BUSINESS EDUCATION,

56, 294-297.

Bass, B., Krusell, J. & Alexander, R. A. (1971) Male managers' attitudes toward working women. AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST, 15(2), 221-236.

Baum, C. (1977) Discrimination on basis of sex: An attributional analysis. DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS INTERNATIONAL, Sept, 38(3-B); 1463.

Bem, S. L. (1981) Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW. 88(4), 354-364.

Benson, D. J. & Thomson, G. E. (1982) Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest, and gender strati- fication. SOCIAL PROBLEMS, 29(3), 236-251.

Berns, W. (1980, October) Terms of endearment: Legislating love. HARPERS, pp. 14-16; 18; 20.

Berstein, P. (1976, August) Sexual harassment on the job. HARPER'S BAZAAR, pp. 33.

Bettner, J. (1979, October 1) How to tame the office wolf--Without getting bitten. BUSINESS WEEK, pp. 107.

Biles, G. E. (1981, June) A program guide for preventing sexual harassment in the workplace. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, pp. 49-56.

Bjorn, L. & Gruber, J. (1982) Awareness of sex discrimination and sexual harassment among women auto workers. MICHIGAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, Fall, 7-24.

Bradford, D.L., Sargent, A. & Sprague, M. (1975) The executive man and woman: The issue of sexuality. In F.E. Gordon and M.H. Strober (Eds.) BRINGING WOMEN INTO MANAGEMENT. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Brewer, M. (1982) Further beyond nine to five: An integration and future directions. SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 149-158.

Brodsky, C. (1976) THE HARASSED WORKER. Lexington, Mass.: Heath.

Bularzik, M. (1978) Sexual harassment at the workplace. Historical notes. RADICAL AMERICA, 12(4), 25-43.

Bureau of National Affairs (1981) SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND LABOR RELATIONS: A BNA SPECIAL REPORT. Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs.

Cadden, V. (1980, July) Romano vs. Lehat. RIGHTS, pp. 3-6.

Campbell, A.K. (1980) Policy statement and definition on sexual harassment. WOMEN IN ACTION, 10(1), 2.

Canadian Human Rights Commission (1983) UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT. Montreal: Minister of Supply and Services, Canada.

Carey, S.H. (1977) SEXUAL POLITICS IN BUSINESS. Unpublished paper; University of Texas at San Antonio.

Collins, E.G.C. & Blodgett, T.B. (1981) Sexual harassment: Some see it...some won't. HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, 59(2), 76-95.

Conte, R. (1982) Sexual harassment. Unpublished thesis. Detroit: Wayne State University, School of Law.

Crull, P. (1980) The impact of sexual harassment on the job: A profile of experiences of 92 women. In D.A. Neugarten & J.M. Shafritz (Eds.) SEXUALITY IN ORGANIZATIONS: ROMANTIC AND COERCIVE BEHAVIORS AT WORK. Oak Park, Ill: Moore, 86-91

Crull, P. (1982) Stress effects of sexual harassment on the job: Implications for counseling. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHOPSYCHIATRY, 52(3), 539-594.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1980) Discrimination because of sex under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; Adoption of interim interpretative quidelines. FEDERAL REGISTER, 45(72), 25024- 25025.

Etzcorn, P. (1979, September/October) Dealing with sexual harassment. WOMEN'S WORK, pp. 11-14; 45.

Etzkowitz, H. (1971) The male sister: Sexual separation of labor in society. JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY, 33,

431-434.

Evans, L. (1978) Sexual harassment: Womens' hidden occupational hazard. In J. R. Chapman & M. Gates (Eds.) THE VICTIMIZATION OF WOMEN. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications, 203-223.

Faley, R. H. (1982) Sexual harassment: Critical review of legal cases with general principles and preventive measures. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, 35(5), 583-600.

Farley, L. (1978) SEXUAL SHAKEDOWN: THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WOMEN ON THE JOB. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Faucher, M. D. & McCulloch, K. (1978) Sexual harassment in the workplace: What should the employer do? EEO, 5(1), 38-46.

Feld, A. (1979, February) Office politics: A game of strategy. TODAY'S SECRETARY, PP. 7-10.

Feldberg, R. & Glenn, E. (1979) Male and female: Job vs. gender models in the sociology of work. SOCIAL PROBLEMS, 26, 524-535.

Fleming, J. D. (1979, July) Shoptalk about shop sex. WORKING WOMAN, pp. 31-34.

Fox, M. F. & Hesse-Biber, S. (1984) WOMEN AT WORK. Palo Alto, Calif: Mayfield.

Franks, V. & Rothblum, E. D. (1983) THE STEREOTYPING OF WOMEN.

New York: Springer Publishing Co.

Friedman, K. (1980, August) AFSCME targets fight against sexual harassment. PUBLIC EMPLOYEE, pp. 10.

Fuller, M.M. (1979) SEXUAL HARASSMENT: HOW TO RECOGNIZE AND DEAL WITH IT. Annapolis, MD: What Would Happen If... Inc.

Ginsberg, G.J. & Koreski, J.G. (1977) Sexual advances by an employee's supervisor: A sex discrimination violation of Title VII? EMPLOYEE RELATIONS LAW JOURNAL, 3(1), 83-93.

Goldberg, A. (1978) Sexual harassment and Title VII: The foundation for elimination of sexual cooperation as an employment condition. MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW, 76(6), 1007-1035.

Goodman, J.L. (1978) Womens' work: Sexual demands on the job. THE CIVIL LIBERTIES REVIEW, 4(6), 55-58.

Gordon, L. (1981, July/August) The politics of sexual harassment. RADICAL AMERICA, pp. 7-14.

Gruber, J. & Bjorn, L. (1981) Sexual harassment on the line: Harassment type, source, and response in the auto industry. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Meeting. September: Toronto, Ontario Canada.

Gruber, J. & Bjorn, L. (1982) Blue collar blues: The sexual harassment of women auto workers. WORK AND OCCUPATIONS, 9(3), 271-298.

Gutek, B.A. (1981) Experiences of sexual harassment: Results from a representative survey. Paper presented at APA, Los Angeles, August 1981.

Gutek, B.A. & Morasch, B. (1982) Sex ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 55-74.

Gutek, B.A., Morasch, B. & Cohen, A.G. (1983) Interpreting social sexual behavior in the work setting. JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL BEHAVIOR, 22(1), 30-48.

Gutek, B.A. & Nakamura, C. (1982) Gender roles and sexuality in the world of work. In E. Allgeier & N. McCormick (Eds) GENDER ROLES AND SEXUAL BEHAVIOR. Palo Alto, Calif: Mayfield, 182-201.

Gutek, B.A., Nakamura, C.Y., Gahart, M., Handschumacher, I. & Russell, D. (1980) Sexuality in the workplace. BASIC AND APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1(3), 255-265.

Hagman, M. & Robinson, R. (1980) Interpreting the new sexual harassment guidelines. PERSONNEL JOURNAL, 59, 996-1000.

Harel, G.H. & Cottledge, K. (1982, Spring) Combatting sexual harassment: The Michigan experience. HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, pp. 2-10.

Hill, M.F. & Behrens, G.K. (1981) Love in the office: A guide for dealing with sexual harassment under Title VII of the

Civil Rights Act of 1964. DEPAUL LAW REVIEW, 30, 581-622.

Hooven, M. & McDonald, N. (1978, November/December) Understanding sexual harassment: The role of capitalism. AEGIS, pp. 31-35.

Jensen, I. & Gutek, B.A. (1982) Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 121-136.

Kandel, W.L. (1982) Sexual harassment law: Beyond Title VII. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS LAW JOURNAL, 8(2), 309-314.

Kanter, R.M. (1977) MEN AND WOMEN OF THE CORPORATION. New York: Basic Books.

Kelber, M. (1977, November) Sexual harassment...the UN's dirty little secret. MS., pp. 51;74.

Konrad, A.M. & Gutek, B.A. (1984) Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexuual harassment. Submitted for publication.

Kronenberger, G.K. & Bourke, D.L. (1981) Effective training and the elimina- tion of sexual harassment. PERSONNEL JOURNAL, 60(11), 879-883.

Leap, T.L. & Gray, E.R. (1980) Corporate responsibility in cases of sexual harassment BUSINESS HORIZONS, 23, 58-65.

Lenhoff, D. (1981) Sexual harassment: No more business as

usual. TRIAL, 17(7), 42-46.

Levin, H. (1980) Womanizing work. PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, 11, 360-368.

Lindsey, K. (1977,NOVEMBER) Sexual harassment on the job. MS., pp.47-51, 74-78.

Littler-Bishop, S., Seidler-Feller, D. & Opaluch, R.E. (1982) Sexual harassment in the workplace as a function of initiators status: The case of airline personnel. SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 137-148.

Livingston, J. (1982) Responses to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational, and individual actions. SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 5-22.

Lublin,K. (1981, April 24) Resisting advances. WALL STREET JOURNAL, pp. 1.

MacKinnon, C. (1979) SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WORKING WOMEN: A CASE OF SEX DIS- CRIMINATION. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Marcus, R. (1980, May 19) Snaring the office wolf. THE NATIONAL LAW REVIEW.

Martin, S.E. (1978) Sexual politics in the workplace: The interactional world of policewomen. SYMBOLIC INTERACTION, 1(2), 44-60.

Martin, S.E. & Fein, S.B. (1978) Sexual harassment in the workplace: A problem whose time has come. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, September 2.

Maypole, D.E. & Skaine, R. (1982) Sexual harassment of blue collar workers. JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WELFARE, 9, 682-695.

Mead, M. (1978, April) A proposal: We need taboos on sex at work. REDBOOK, pp. 31-33; 38

Meyer, M.C., Berchtold, I.M., Oestreich, J.L. & Collins, F.J. (1981) SEXUAL HARASSMENT. Princeton, NJ: Petrocelli Books.

Michigan Department of Labor. Office of Women and Work (undated) SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON THE JOB: A PACKET OF INFORMATION FOR EMPLOYEES. Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Department of Labor, Office of Women and Work.

Nardino, M. (1978) Discrimination: Sex--Title VII--Cause of action. SETON HALL LAW REVIEW, 9(1), 108-129.

Neugarten, G.A. & Shafritz, J.M. (Eds.) (1980) SEXUALITY IN ORGANIZATIONS: ROMANTIC AND COERSIVE BEHAVIORS AT WORK. Oak Park, Ill.: Moore.

New Responses, Inc. (1979) REPORT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT. Arlington, VA: New Responses, Inc.

Nieva, V.F. & Gutek, B.A. (1981) WOMEN AND WORK: A

PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE. New York: Praeger.

Petersen, D.J. & Massengill, D. (1982) Sexual harassment--a growing problem in the workplace. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, October, 79-88.

Pogrebin, L.C. (1977, June) Sex harassment: The working woman. LADIES HOME JOURNAL, pp. 24.

Polanski, E. (1980) Sexual harassment in the workplace. HUMAN RIGHTS, 8, p. 14-19, 46-47.

Popovich, P.M. & Licata, B.J. (1984, August) Sexual harasment in the organization: A role theory approach. Paper presented at the 44th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. Boston, MA

Powell, G.N. (1983, July/August) Sexual harassment: Confronting the issue of definition. BUSINESS HORIZONS, pp. 24-28.

Powell, G.N. (1983) Sex-role identity and definition of sexual harassment: Are they related? Paper presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. Dallas, Texas

Quinn, R. (1977) Coping with cupid: The formation, impact, and management of romantic relationships in organizations. ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY, 22(1), 30-45.

Ragan, J.W. & Leana, C.R. (1984, August) Sexual harassment at work: Incidence, causes and managerial response. Paper

presented at the 44th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. Boston, MA.

Reilly, T., Carpenter, S. Dull, V. & Bartlett, K. (1982) The factorial survey: An approach to defining sexual harassment on campus. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 99-110.

Renick, J. (1980) Sexual harassment at work: Why it happens, what to do about it. PERSONNEL JOURNAL, 59(8), 658-662.

Rhodin, N.K. (1976) Comment: Employment discrimination--sexual harassment and Title VII--female employees' claim alleging verbal and physical advances by a male supervisor dismissed as nonactionable--Corne vs. Bausch & Lomb, Inc. New York University Lae Review, 51, 148-165.

Rivers, C. (1978) Sexual harassment: The executive's alternative to rape. MOTHER JONES, 3(5), p. 21-22; 24; 28-29.

Rowe, M.P. (1981) Dealing with sexual harassment. HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, 59(3), 42-46.

Safran, C. (1976, November) What men do to women on the job: A shocking look at sexual harassment. REDBOOK, pp. 149; 217-223.

Savitzky, L. & Gutek, B.A. (1983, April) Sex ratios and sexual behaviors at work. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Francisco,

California.

Sawyer, S. & Whately, A. (198,January) Sexual harassment: A form of sex discrimination. THE PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, pp. 36-38; 107-109.

Schneider, B.E. (1982) Consciousness about sexual harassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 75-98.

Sexual Harassment and Labor Relations. (1981) LABOR RELATIONS REPORTER: Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 107(23), 1-24.

Sexual harassment lands companies in court. (1979, October 1) BUSINESS WEEK, pp. 120-122.

Sexual harassment rampant at HUD (1979, July/August) IMPACT JOURNAL, pp. 1; 5; 7.

Sexual tension: Some mwn find the office is a little too exciting with women as peers. (1981,April 14) WALL STREET JOURNAL, pp. 1f

Seymour, W.C. (1979,March) Sexual harassment: Fighting a cause of action under Title VII. LABOR LAW JOURNAL, 30, 139-156.

Shank, K. (1978, May) Sexual harassment: In the classroom. . .On the job. SISTER COUURAGE, pp. 8-9.

Shatt, D.K. & Agrest, S. (1979) A steno who said 'no'! NEWSWEEK, April 30, p. 72

Silverman, D. (1976-77, Winter) Sexual harassment: Working womens' dilemma. QUEST: A FEMINIST QUARTERLY, 3(3), 15-24.

Skrocki, M.R. (1978, March) Right now: Sexual pressure on the job. MCCALL'S, pp. 43.

Somers, A. (1982) Sexual harassment in academe: Legal issues and definitions. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 23-32.

Somers, P. (1980, November) Sexual harassment in the office. MANAGEMENT WORLD, pp. 10-11.

Somers, P. & Clemenston-Mohr, J. (1979, April) Sexual extortion in the workplace. THE PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, pp. 23-28.

SPOKANE CHRONICLE. (1982) Sex harassment tallied. Nov. 17, A2.

Stanley-Elliot, L.E. (1981) Sexual harassment in the workplace: Title VII's imperfect relief. JOURNAL OF CORPORATION LAW, 6, 625-648.

Stover, P. & Gilles, Y. (1979) SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE. Ann Arbor: Institution of Labor and Industrial Relations, Program on Women and Work.

Stromberg, A. & Harkness, S. (1978) WOMEN WORKING: THEORIES AND FACTS IN PERSPECTIVE. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Sullivan, A. M. (1979, August) Women say no to sexual harassment. COAL AGE, pp. 74-81.

Tangri, S.S., Burt, M.R. & Johnson, L.B. (1982) Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES, 33(4), 33-54.

Thurston, K. (1980,December) Sexual harassment: An organizational perspective. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, pp. 75-80.

Till, F.J. (1980, August) SEXUAL HARASSMENT: A REPORT ON THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF STUDENTS. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education; National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.

Tillar, D.L. (1979,May) Sexual harassment in employment: The double bind. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FORUM, pp. 4-6.

Tillar, D.L. (1980, July) Sexual harassment: New rules to the game. FORUM, pp. 17-19.

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE FEDERAL WORKPLACE: IS IT A PROBLEM? Washington, D.C.: USGPO.

Waks, J.W. & Starr, M.G. (1981/82) Sexual harassment in the work place: The scope of employer liability. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS LAW JOURNAL, 7(3), 369-388.

Waks, J.W. & Starr, M.G. (1982) The 'sexual shakedown' in perspective: Sexual harassment in its social and legal contexts.. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS LAW JOURNAL, 7(4), 567-586.

Weber-Burdin, E. & Rossi, P.H. (1982) Defining sexual harassment on campus: A replication and extension. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES, 38(4), 99-110.

Weisel, K. (1977) Title VII: Legal protection against sexual harassment. WASHINGTON LAW REVIEW, 53, 123-144.

White, S. (1977, April) The office pass. ACROSS THE BOARD, pp. 17-20.

Wolf, W. & Fligstein, N.D. (1979) Sex and authority in the workplace: The causes of sexual inequality. AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 44(2), 235-252.

Wolf, W. & Fligstein, N.D. (1979) Sexual stratification: Differences in power in the work setting. SOCIAL FORCES, 58(1), 95-107.

Woodrum, R.L. (1981, Winter) Sexual harassment: New concern about an old problem. S.A.M. ADVANCED MANAGEMENT JOURNAL, pp. 20-26.

Working Women United Institute. (1980) PROJECT STATEMENT: SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON THE JOB. New York: Working Women United Institute.

Zemke, R. (1981) Sexual harassment: Is training the key? TRAINING, 22, 27-28.

Table 1

Estimate of Full-time Unit 1 Civil Service Employees by Job Category, Ethnic Group and Sex in Relation to Total Full Time Workforce and Labor Force Parity Standards

Job Categories in Unit 1		TOTAL #	TOTAL %	WHITE #	WHITE %	BLACK #	BLACK %	HISPANIC #	HISPANIC %	ASIAN #	ASIAN %	FILIPINO #	FILIPINO %	AMER. INDIAN #	AMER. INDIAN %	OTHER #	OTHER %
		18,401	100	13,324	72.4	1,330	7.2	1,348	7.3	1,428	7.8	440	2.4	72	.4	459	2.5
		15.3%		15.6%		10.9%		11.2%		22.9%		19.0%		9.5%		29.3%	
PROFESSIONAL	M		65.8		48.5		3.7		4.9		5.6		1.0		.2		1.9
	F		34.2		15.6		10.9		11.2		22.9		19.0		9.5		29.3
ADMINISTRATIVE		9,118	100	6,095	66.8	992	10.9	1,113	12.2	629	6.9	111	1.2	75	.8	103	1.1
STAFF-		7.6%		7.1%		8.1%		9.2%		10.1%		4.8%		9.9%		6.6%	
Nonsupervisory	M		44.8		30.4		4.3		5.6		3.2		.4		.3		.6
	F		55.2		7.1		8.1		9.2		10.1		4.8		9.9		6.6
TOTAL WORK FORCE		120,568	100	85,464	70.9	12,190	10.1	12,044	10.0	6,231	5.2	2,321	1.9	754	.6	1,564	1.3
		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%	
	M		55.7		41.1		4.6		5.3		2.6		.8		.3		.8
	F		44.3		29.8		5.5		4.7		2.5		1.2		.3		.5
1980 LABOR FORCE	M	57.2		40%		3.4		10.4		1.9		.8		.4		.3	
PARITY STANDARDS	F	42.8		29.8%		3.2		6.8		1.7		.8		.3		.2	
	T	100%		69.8		6.6		17.2		3.6		1.6		.7		.5	

Table 2

Ethnicity of Survey Respondents

	State Percentages (March 1982)	Survey Totals %	Female %	Male %
Amer. Indian	.6%	1.3%	1.6%	.5%
Asian	5.2%	6.2%	5.4%	8.2%
Black	10.1%	5.4%	5.8%	4.6%
Filipino	1.9%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%
Hispanic	10.0%	9.5%	10.7%	7.1%
White	70.9%	71.9%	71.5%	73.3%
Other	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%	1.9%
Decline to State	-	2.2%	2.1%	2.2%
No Answer	-	.9%	.3%	.8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)

Table 3

Age of Survey Respondents

Age	Survey Totals	Female	Male	Undeclared
55 or older	12.9%	12.0%	14.7%	3
45-54 yrs	22.3%	20.1%	26.2%	9
35-44 yrs	32.8%	33.9%	31.6%	5
25-34 yrs	28.5%	31.0%	24.3%	4
20-24 yrs	2.7%	2.6%	3.0%	-
16-19 yrs	.3%	.4%	-	-
No answer	.5%	-	.3%	5
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 4

Marital Status of Survey Respondents

Marital Status	Survey Totals	Female	Male	Undeclared
Single	20.2%	19.8%	21.8%	3
Married	58.6%	54.6%	66.8%	14
Divorced, Separated	18.1%	22.0%	10.4%	3
Widowed	2.4%	3.0%	1.1%	1
No answer	.6%	.3%	-	5
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 5

Education Levels of Survey Respondents

Education	Survey Totals	Female	Male	Undeclared
Ph.D./M.D., etc.	1.0%	.2%	2.7%	-
Masters degree or other graduate work	18.8%	14.4%	27.0%	8
B.A. or equivalent	39.3%	35.4%	48.8%	5
Some college or trade school	34.9%	42.3%	20.2%	7
High school graduate or GED	4.9%	6.9%	.8%	1
Some high school	.6%	.8%	.3%	-
No answer	.5%	-	.3%	5
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 6

Job Categories of Survey Respondents

Job Category	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
High level admin.	.3%	.3%	.3%	-
Other admin.	4.3%	3.8%	4.9%	2
Specialist/consultant	16.8%	14.5%	21.5%	4
Analyst/auditor	31.3%	29.0%	36.2%	7
Appraiser/officer	2.4%	1.7%	3.8%	1
Planner/inspecter	5.4%	4.2%	7.9%	1
Examiner/representative	11.8%	13.3%	9.0%	2
Technician/assistant	8.4%	10.9%	3.5%	1
Interpreter/clerk/guide	3.4%	3.7%	2.5%	2
Interviewer/intern/ student assistant	9.6%	11.6%	5.2%	3
Other	5.0%	5.4%	4.6%	-
No answer	1.4%	1.5%	.5%	3
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 7

Length of Employment at Current Job

Length of Employment	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
10 or more yrs	18.6%	14.5%	27.0%	5
7-9 yrs	12.3%	12.5%	12.5%	1
4-6 yrs	25.3%	24.7%	26.7%	6
1-3 yrs	33.5%	37.2%	26.2%	8
Less than 1 yr	9.5%	10.7%	7.4%	1
No Answer	.8%	.4%	.3%	5
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 8

Work Schedules of Survey Respondents

Work Schedule	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
Permanent Full Time	77.9%	73.2%	87.7%	20
Temporary Full Time	1.7%	1.6%	1.9%	-
Permanent Part Time	13.9%	18.1%	5.7%	2
Temporary Part Time	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	1
Other	4.4%	5.1%	3.3%	-
No Answer	.6%	.5%	-	3
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 9

Current County of Employment of the Survey Respondents

County	# of surveys mailed	# of surveys received	return rate
Alameda	218	36	17%
Alpine	0	0	-
Amador	1	0	0%
Butte	29	7	24%
Calaveras	0	0	-
Colusa	0	0	-
Contra Costa	42	9	21%
Del Norte	3	2	66%
El Dorado	10	5	50%
Fresno	195	27	13%
Glenn	0	0	-
Humboldt	28	6	21%
Imperial	32	5	16%
Inyo	7	2	29%
Kern	85	18	21%
Kings	16	2	13%
Lake	6	0	0%
Lassen	8	0	0%
Los Angeles	1085	179	16%
Madera	10	1	10%
Marin	18	3	17%
Mariposa	0	0	-
Mendocino	10	3	30%
Merced	15	8	53%
Modoc	3	1	33%
Mono	0	0	-
Monterey	49	7	14%
Napa	20	3	15%
Nevada	4	0	0%
Orange	225	40	18%
Placer	12	2	17%
Plumas	0	0	-
Riverside	50	12	24%
Sacramento	2358	482	20%
San Benito	4	0	0%
San Bernardino	130	29	22%
San Diego	204	47	23%
San Francisco	324	66	20%
San Joaquin	102	20	20%
San Luis Obispo	66	16	24%
San Mateo	41	6	15%
Santa Barbara	33	12	36%
Santa Clara	43	24	56%
Santa Cruz	27	8	30%
Shasta	33	6	18%
Sierra	0	0	-
Siskiyou	8	2	25%
Solano	34	3	9%
Sonoma	45	10	22%
Stanislas	55	10	18%
Sutter	6	2	33%
Tehama	11	0	0%
Trinity	0	0	-
Tulare	48	8	17%
Tuolemne	6	0	0%
Ventura	66	16	24%
Yolo	22	3	14%
Yuba	28	2	7%
No answer		1	

Table 10

Length of Employment of Respondents at Current Type of Work and as California Civil Service Employee.

Length Category	Current type of Work	Female	Male	Unde-clared	State Employee	Female	Male	Unde-clared
10 or more yrs	37.1%	30.9%	49.3%	12	45.9%	42.9%	52.6%	10
7-9 years	16.1%	18.7%	11.1%	2	20.6%	22.3%	18.0%	2
4-6 years	22.2%	23.0%	21.0%	4	17.0%	17.7%	15.8%	4
1-3 years	19.7%	22.3%	15.0%	3	11.7%	12.8%	27.7%	4
Less than 1 yr	4.5%	5.1%	3.5%	-	4.1%	4.4%	3.5%	1
No answer	.4%	-	-	5	.7%	-	.8%	5
	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 11

Salary for Survey Respondents

Salary Category	Salary for All Survey Respondents				Salary for Survey Respondents Employed Full-time			
	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
$50,000 & up	.2%	-	.5%	-	.1%	-	.1%	-
$30,000 to $49,999	18.0%	7.3%	40.3%	4	22.3%	9.3%	44.7%	4
$20,000 to $29,999	47.1%	50.8%	39.8%	11	57.3%	65.3%	43.8%	11
$10,000 to $19,999	26.6%	32.7%	13.6%	8	19.0%	23.8%	10.3%	5
Under $10,000	7.3%	8.4%	5.4%	-	.9%	1.1%	.6%	-
No Answer	.9%	.8%	.3%	3	.4%	.5%	.3%	-
	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)	(N=916)	(N=567)	(N=328)	(N=20)

Table 12

Opinion of Survey Respondents of the EEOC Definition of Sexual Harassment.

Opinion Category	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
Agree strongly	75.8%	80.3%	66.2%	21
Agree somewhat	17.1%	13.2%	25.6%	3
Disagree somewhat	2.1%	1.5%	3.0%	2
Disagree strongly	4.1%	4.0%	4.6%	-
No Answer	.9%	1.1%	.5%	-
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 13

Incidents in the Workplace: What Constitutes Sexual Harassment.

Incident	Yes, it is Sexual Harassment			
	Total N=1151	Female N=758	Male N=367	Undeclared N=26
Sex relations as part of job	98.6%	98.3%	99.2%	26
Asked to go out with someone as part of job	96.2%	97.1%	94.6%	24
Touching at work that was meant to be sexual	85.0%	88.4%	77.7%	23
Looks or gestures of a sexual nature that were meant to be insulting	83.9%	86.7%	77.9%	23
Looks or gestures of a sexual nature that were meant to be compli-mentary	46.2%	53.0%	33.0%	9
Comments of a sexual nature that were meant to be insulting	84.6%	86.7%	80.1%	23
Comments of a sexual nature that were meant to be complimentary	47.7%	53.7%	36.2%	9
Receiving uninvited letters, phone calls, gifts, materials of a sexually suggestive nature	85.1%	89.4%	75.5%	25

Table 14

Degree of Problem of Sexual Harassment in the State Workplace.

Responses	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
Major problem	4.9%	4.9%	4.9%	2
Minor problem	29.5%	31.3%	26.4%	6
No problem	64.4%	62.5%	68.4%	16
No answer	1.2%	1.3%	.5%	2
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 15

Awareness of Departmental Policy Regarding Sexual Harassment.

Responses to: "Within your department, are you aware of a departmental policy in regard to sexual harassment?"

Response	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
Yes	54.3%	53.3%	56.9%	12
Don't know	18.9%	18.9%	19.1%	5
No	25.6%	26.1%	24.0%	9
No answer	1.7%	1.7%	-	-
	100%	100%	100%	
	(N=1151)	(N=758)	(N=367)	(N=26)

Table 16

Effectiveness of Sexual Harassment Complaint Policy

Area of effectiveness	Yes, Effective			
	Total N=625	Female N=390	Male N=195	Undeclared
Defining sexual harassment	64.6%	64.6%	64.1%	9
Educating employees about their rights	64 %	63.9%	64.6%	7
Educating employees about informal actions	50.1%	50 %	50.7%	5
Educating employees about formal actions	57.4%	56.7%	59.3%	6
Informing employees about potential consequences for "harasser"	41.6%	37.8%	49.3%	5
Informing employees about additional complaint options	43.7%	43.3%	44.5%	5
Really not effective in any of above areas (agreement with this statement indicates policy was not effective in any of the above areas)	11.1%	9.1%	14.4%	3

* N's vary on this question, 625 respondents said 'yes' they were aware of a policy in their department.

Table 17

Effectiveness of Special Seminar or Awareness Training for Employees in Regard to Sexual Harassment.*

Area of Effectiveness	Total N=348 per area (Yes, Effective)	Female N=235 (Yes, Effective)	Male N=105 (Yes, Effective)	Undeclared N=8 (Yes, Effective)
Defining sexual harassment	54.8%	58.8%	47.9%	3
Educating employees about their rights	57.0%	60.1%	49.7%	7
Educating employees about informal actions	46.0%	48.2%	41.7%	4
Educating employees about formal actions	51.0%	52.4%	48.5%	4
Informing employees about potential consequences for "harasser"	39.0%	36.9%	43.6%	3
Informing employees about additional complaint options	39.2%	38.4%	39.9%	5
Really not effective in any of above areas**	5.4%	4.9%	6.1%	1

* This table only includes those respondents who attended or knew of a seminar in their departments.

** Agreement with statement that seminar was not effective in any of the above areas.

Table 18

Initial Awareness of Departmental Sexual Harassment Complaint Process.

Possible Sources of Information	Total N=605 per source	Female N=398	Male N=194	Undeclared
Received written copy without request	50.1%	47.5%	55.2%	7
Received written copy upon request	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	-
Told about it by a coworker	12.6%	11.1%	16.5%	-
Told about it by a supervisor	22.6%	21.6%	24.2%	4
Departmental Seminar	24.3%	22.9%	28.4%	1
Written copy posted in my work area	18.0%	17.1%	20.6%	1
Other*	18.8%	21.1%	14.4%	2

* Most writen-in answers indicated a film about sexual harassment had been shown within the department.

Table 19

If Harassed at Current Workplace and Filed Complaint Situations: Likelihood of Occurrance.

Occurance	Total (N=1151 per occurance)	Female N=758	Male N=367	Undeclared
			(Very Likely)	
There would be enforcement of the policies which prohibit sexual harassment	36.1%	35.9%	37.3%	7
My department/agency supervisors would care about my feelings concerning the sexual harassment	42.3%	44.9%	37.9%	8
A thorough investigation of my complaint would be carried out	37.4%	38.0%	37.1%	7
The complaint process would be swift	19.1%	18.6%	20.2%	5
I would suffer retaliation because of my complaint	18.6%	20.7%	13.9%	6

Table 20

Most Effective Actions for Supervisors/Administrators to take Regarding Sexual Harassment.

Actions	Total (N=1151 per action)	Female N=758	Male N=367	Undeclared
Establish and publicize policies which prohibit sexual harassment	79.3%	79.6%	79.3%	19
Conduct swift and thorough investigations of complaints of sexual harassment	80.5%	81.0%	79.8%	19
Enforce penalties against those who sexually bother others	75.5%	77.0%	72.5%	19
Enforce penalties against supervisors or administrators who knowingly allow this behavior to continue	72.1%	73.1%	70.3%	18
Publicize the availability of formal complaint channels	73.0%	73.1%	73.3%	17
Establish a special service for those who experience sexual harassment	49.3%	51.8%	43.6%	15
Provide awareness training for supervisors and EEO officials on their responsibilities for decreasing sex harassment	66.2%	68.6%	61.6%	16
Provide awareness training for employees on sexual harassment	68.0%	70.1%	64.6%	15

Table 21

Availability and Perceived Effectiveness of Actions

Action	Total	Female (N=758)	Definitely Yes Male (N=367)	Undeclared
Informal and confidential presentation of a complaint to a competent counselor				
- availability	18.7%	18.9%	18.5%	4
- effectiveness	22.1%	23.9%	18.5%	5
Requesting an investigation by my department				
- availability	31.0%	30.5%	33.0%	5
- effectiveness	22.7%	25.1%	18.3%	4
Requesting an investigation by an outside agency				
- availability	9.7%	9.5%	10.4%	2
- effectiveness	16.9%	18.2%	14.2%	4
Filing a discrimination complaint within my department				
- availability	46.7%	46.3%	48.0%	11
- effectiveness	24.0%	26.1%	20.2%	4
Filing a complaint through special channels in my dept. set up for sexual harassment complaints				
- availability	22.4%	21.9%	24.0%	4
- effectiveness	18.2%	19.5%	16.1%	3
Appealing a dept. decision regarding harassment to higher channels				
- availability	22.8%	20.7%	27.8%	4
- effectiveness	17.7%	19.3%	15.0%	3
Being represented by a person of my choice at each step of the process				
- availability	16.2%	15.2%	17.7%	6
- effectiveness	21.5%	23.5%	17.2%	7

Table 22

Employees' Projected Actions Concerning Sexual Harassment

Actions (Would Take)

Rank	Females (N=758)	Males (N=367)
1	ask or tell person to stop (86.7%)	ask or tell person to stop (78.7%)
2	document the complaint/ incident (83.5%)	document the complaint/ incident (77.7%)
3	report behavior to supervisor (72.8%)	report behavior to supervisor (55.6%)
4	avoid the person (65.2%)	avoid the person (47.7%)
5	file internal complaint (59.5%)	file internal complaint (46%)
6	request investigation by my department (50.4%)	request investigation by my department (37.9%)
7	threaten to tell co-workers (45.1%)	obtain copies of personnel file (36.8%)
8	file grievance with union (45%)	file grievance with union (36.7%)
9	obtain copies of personnel file (39.1%)	threaten to tell co-workers (34.9%)
10	talk with EEOC/AA designate (38.1%)	talk with EEOC/AA designate (27.2%)
11	appeal to State Personnel Board (29.9%)	ignore the behavior (23.2%)
12	file a complaint with external government agency (17.5%)	appeal to State Personnel Board (21%)
13	ignore the behavior (16.9%)	file complaint with external government agency (16.3%)
14	request investigation by outside agency (15.7%)	file civil charges (10.6%)
15	seek professional counseling (11.1%)	request investigation by outside agency (10.5%)
16	file civil charges (9.9%)	ask for a transfer (8.7%)
17	ask for a transfer (8.3%)	hire an attorney (7.1%)
18	hire an attorney (6.6%)	seek professional counseling (6%)
19	file criminal charges (5.1%)	file criminal charges (5.7%)
20	go along with the behavior (2.2%)	go along with the behavior (3%)
21	quit the job (1.2%)	quit the job (.8%)

Table 23

Personal Experiences of Respondents

Situations	Possible Responses							
	NO				YES*			
	Total[1]	Female	Male	Undeclared	Total[1]	Female	Male	Undeclared
Comments of a sexual nature that are meant to be compliments	30.6%	23.5%	45 %	9	68.7%	75.7%	54.5%	17
Comments of a sexual nature that are meant to be an insult or a put down	70.5%	67.9%	75.7%	18	28.8%	31.4%	23.4%	8
Looks/gestures of a sexual nature that are meant to be compliments	38.4%	32.1%	51 %	12	60 %	66.8%	46.6%	14
Looks/gestures of a sexual nature that are meant to be an insult or a put down	73.2%	70.1%	79.3%	21	24.9%	28 %	19.1%	5
Touched by a person in a way that is meant to be sexual	70 %	66.8%	76.6%	19	28.6%	31.5%	22.6%	7
Expected to engage in sexual relations with another person(s) in order to get a job or a promotion or to keep from being fired	95.4%	94.2%	97.5%	26	3.6%	4.6%	1.6%	-
Expected to go out with a person with the understanding that it would hurt your job situation if refused and help if accepted	92.4%	90.9%	95.1%	26	6.4%	7.8%	4.1%	-
Target of sexual jokes at your workplace	55.1%	54.1%	55.6%	20	43.3%	43.8%	43.6%	6
Received uninvited letters, phone calls, gifts and/or materials of a sexually suggestive nature	86.8%	84.6%	91 %	-	12.4%	14.4%	8.7%	2

* Yes answers included: yes, somewhat infrequently; yes, somewhat frequently; & yes, very frequently.

1 - Total N for each situation = 1151

Table 24

Experiences of Others Known to Respondents

(Yes, S/He was a State Employee)

Experiences	Total (N=1151 per experience)	Female N=758	Male N-367	Undeclared
Has anyone you know ever received sexual remarks from a person(s) that were meant to be complimentary?	45.1%	46.8%	41.7%	11
Has anyone you know ever received sexual comments from a person(s) that were meant to be insulting?	26.9%	28.4%	24.3%	6
Has anyone you know ever received sexual looks or gestures from a person(s) that were meant to be complimentary	39.0%	39.6%	38.4%	8
Has anyone you know ever received sexual looks or gestures meant to be insulting	19.6%	21.5%	16.1%	4
Has anyone you know ever been touched by a person on the job in a sexual way	27.1%	27.0%	28.3%	3
Has anyone you know ever been asked out on a date as part of their job?	13.2%	14.6%	10.6%	2
Has anyone you know ever been asked by a person(s) to engage in sexual relations as part of their job?	10.4%	10.8%	10.1%	1
Is anyone you know the target of sexual jokes at their workplace?	32.3%	32.7%	32.2%	6
Has anyone you know ever received any uninvited letters, phone calls, gifts, and/or materials of a sexually suggestive nature as an employee?	15.7%	15.0%	17.2%	4

Table 25

Ethnicity of Sexually Harassed Respondents

		Sexually Harassed Respondents			
Ethnic Group	Survey Total	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
Amer. Indian	1.3%	1.4%	1.6%	-	-
Asian	6.2%	.9%	1.1%	-	-
Black	5.4%	.7%	6.9%	10.0%	-
Filipino	1.3%	2.3%	2.1%	5.0%	-
Hispanic	9.5%	15.5%	16.4%	10.0%	-
White	71.9%	66.7%	66.1%	75.0%	2
Other	1.5%	.5%	.5%	-	-
Decline to state	2.2%	3.8%	4.2%	-	-
No answer	.9%	1.9%	1.1%	-	2
	(N=1151)	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 26

Age of Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment

Age Category	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
55+ up	4.7%	3.7%	15.0%	-
45-54	13.6%	12.7%	20.0%	1
35-44	46.0%	46.6%	45.0%	1
25-34	32.9%	34.9%	20.0%	-
20-24	1.4%	1.6%	-	-
16-19	.5%	.5%	-	-
No answer	.9%	-	-	2
	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 27

Marital Status of Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment.

Marital Status	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
Single	25.8%	25.4%	30.0%	1
Married	44.6%	43.9%	55.0%	1
Divorced/Separated	26.8%	28.6%	15.0%	-
Widowed	1.9%	2.1%	-	-
No answer	.9%	-	-	2
	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 28

Education Level of Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment.

Education Level	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
Ph.D. - M.D.	.9%	-	10.0%	-
MA or other grad work	18.3%	18.5%	20.0%	-
BA	42.3%	40.7%	55.0%	2
Some College or Trade School	34.7%	37.6%	15.0%	-
High School Graduate	2.3%	2.6%	-	-
Some High School	.5%	.5%	-	-
No Answer	.9%	-	-	2
	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 29

Occupations of Respondents Reporting

Job Category	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
High level admin.	-	-	-	-
Other admin.	5.2%	5.3%	5.0%	-
Sepcialist-consultant	19.2%	18.5%	30.0%	-
Analyst-auditor	30.5%	31.7%	15.0%	2
Appraiser-officer	3.3%	2.6%	10.0%	-
Planner-inspector	6.6%	5.3%	15.0%	1
Examiner-representative	11.3%	11.1%	15.0%	-
Technician-assistant	8.5%	9.5%	-	-
Interpreter-clerk-guide	2.3%	1.6%	.5%	1
Interviewer-intern-student	6.1%	6.9%	-	-
Other	5.6%	5.8%	.5%	-
No answer	1.4%	1.6%	-	-
	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 30

Length of Time Employed at Current State Job
of Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment.

Length	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
10 yrs & up	14.1%	12.2%	35%	-
7-9 yrs	12.7%	13.2%	10%	-
4-6 yrs	23.0%	21.7%	35%	1
1-3 yrs	40.8%	43.9%	15%	1
Less than 1 yr	8.0%	8.5%	5%	-
No answer	1.4%	.5%	-	2
	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 31

Length of Employment for State of California of those respondents resporting sexual harassment.

Length	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
10 yrs & up	43.7%	43.4%	50%	1
7-9 yrs	25.4%	27.0%	15%	-
4-6 yrs	19.7%	19.0%	25%	1
1-3 yrs	8.9%	9.0%	10%	-
Less than 1 yr	1.4%	1.6%	-	-
No answer	.9%	-	-	2
	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 32

Salary Level of Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment.

Salary Level	Total	Female	Male	Undeclared
$50,000 & up	.5%	-	5%	-
$30,000 to 49,999	11.7%	11.1%	15%	1
$20,000 to 29,999	59.2%	59.3%	60%	2
$10,000 to 19,999	24.9%	25.9%	20%	-
Under 10,000	3.3%	3.7%	-	-
No answer	.5%	-	-	1
	(N=213)	(N=189)	(N=20)	

Table 33

Classification of Sexual Harassment Experience Reported on Questionnaire.

	CHECKED			
Classification	Total N=213	Female N=189	Male N=20	Undeclared
This was my only experience	27.2%	27.5%	30.0%	-
This was my most recent experience	26.3%	27.0%	25.0%	-
This was the experience that had the greatest effect on me	37.6%	38.6%	25.0%	2
This experience is still continuing	16.9%	15.3%	35.0%	-

* Twelve victims did not fill out this series of questionnaires

* Subjects were instructed to check all categories that applied to their experience

Table 34

Actions* Taken By Victims

Action Taken	Total (N=213 per action)	Female N=189	Male N=20	Undeclared
Ignore the behavior	73.7%	74.6%	75 %	1
Avoid the person(s)	69 %	73.5%	35 %	1
Ask or tell the person(s) to stop	57.3%	59.8%	35 %	2
Report the behavior to a supervisor or other officials	30.5%	30.7%	30 %	1
Document the complaint/ incident	26.3%	25.4%	40 %	-

* Top 5 actions to be taken

Table 35

Management Response to Complaint; Grievance; Request for Investigation.

Response	Total (N=40 per response)	Female	Male	Undeclared
Found my charge to be true	32.5%	36.4%	16.7%	-
Found no support for my charge	15.0%	15.2%	16.7%	-
Took corrective action in my favor (back pay, promotion, etc.)	5.0%	3.0%	16.7%	-
Took action against the person who bothered me	20.0%	18.2%	16.7%	1
Were hostile and/or took action against me	27.5%	27.3%	33.7%	-
Did nothing	37.5%	42.4%	16.7%	-
The action is still being processed	15.0%	12.1%	33.3%	-
I don't know whether management did anything	27.5%	24.2%	50.0%	-

* 1 respondent left all responses in this section blank

Table 36

Reasons for Actions Taken (For Not Filing Complaint; Grievance; Request for Investigation)

Reason	Total (N=173 per reason)	Female	Male	Undeclared
I did not know what actions to take	27.2%	27.6%	14.3%	2
I saw no need to report it	29.5%	26.3%	57.1%	2
I did not want to hurt the person who bothered me	13.3%	13.5%	14.3%	-
I was too upset or embarassed	17.3%	17.9%	7.1%	1
I did not think anything would be done about it	42.8%	43.6%	35.7%	1
I thought it would take too much time and/or effort	4.0%	4.5%	-	-
I thought it would be held against me or I would be blamed	32.9%	35.9%	7.1%	-
I thought it would make my work situation unpleasant	50.3%	52.6%	21.4%	2

* 8 Respondents left this section completely blank

Table 37

Familiarity with Complaint System Reported by
Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment

Degree of Familiarity	Familiarity at Time of Harassment Incident				Familiarity at Time of Questionnaire			
	Total N=213	Female	Male	Undeclared	Total N=213	Female	Male	Undeclared
Very familiar	7.5%	6.3%	15 %	1	26.3%	26.5%	30 %	-
Somewhat familiar	22.5%	22.8%	25 %	-	46.5%	46.6%	45 %	2
Not at all familiar	68.1%	68.8%	60 %	3	25.8%	25.4%	25 %	2
	* 4 respondents left this question blank				* 3 respondents left this question blank			

Table 38

Factors in Current Lack of Familiarity with Complaint System.

Factors	Total N=154	Female N=138	Male N=12	Undeclared
Information is not available	39.1%	41.7%	21.4%	-
Information is not clear	26.6%	23.8%	50.0%	2
Information about this process is not important to me	11.8%	11.3%	7.1%	2
Marked: Not available and not clear	11.8%	12.6%	7.1%	-
Marked: Not available and not important	1.2%	1.3%	-	-
Marked: Not clear and not important	.6%	.7%	-	-

Table 39

Consequences of Sexual Harassment Suffered by Person(s) Known to Respondent.

Consequence	Total (N=1151 per consequence)	Yes, as a State Employee		
		Female	Male	Undeclared
Quit a job	5.7%	6.5%	4.6%	-
Asked for transfer or got another job	16.3%	17.8%	13.9%	2
Gone after promotion or a job given up	7.6%	7.4%	7.6%	3
Illness as a result of stress	8.9%	10.2%	6.5%	2
Upset enough to miss time at work	12.8%	13.5%	11.7%	2
Upset enough to talk to coworkers, friend or other	25.5%	26.5%	24.5%	2
Been refused a job or promotion	5.0%	6.3%	2.5%	1
Work assignments made worse or harder	9.7%	11.1%	7.6%	-
Received poor job perf. rating or poor job reference	7.5%	8.2%	5.7%	3
Problems with inter-personal relationships	8.5%	9.5%	6.8%	1
Sought professional counseling	4.3%	4.7%	3.3%	2
Affected ability to perform to full potential at work	15.5%	16.9%	13.1%	2
Affected ability to work with others	12.0%	12.4%	11.7%	1
Affected ability to work with harasser	18.8%	20.2%	16.1%	4

Table 40

Consequences of Sexual Harassment Suffered by those Respondents Reporting Sexual Harassment.

Consequence	Total N=213	Yes, as a State Employee: Female N=189	Male N=20	Undeclared
Quit a job	4.7%	5.3%	-	-
Asked for transfer or got another job	24.5%	25.5%	20 %	-
Gone after promotion or a job given up	13.2%	12.2%	25 %	-
Illness as a result of stress	25 %	25.5%	20 %	1
Upset enough to miss time at work	29.2%	30.3%	20 %	1
Upset enough to talk to coworker, friend or other	63.2%	65.4%	45 %	2
Been refused a job or promotion	15.6%	16 %	15 %	-
Work assignments made worse or harder	30.2%	30.3%	35 %	-
Received poor job perf. rating or poor job reference	19.8%	18.1%	40 %	-
Problems with inter-personal relationships	26.4%	26.6%	25 %	1
Sought professional counseling	11.8%	12.2%	5 %	1
Affected ability to perform to full potential at work	44.8%	45.7%	35 %	2
Affected ability to work with others	29.2%	30.9%	20 %	-
Affected ability to work with harasser	60.8%	63.3%	40 %	2